

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: September 24, 2014

Screeener: Veronique Morin

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 6951

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Morocco

**PROJECT TITLE:** Enhancing the climate resilience of the Moroccan ports sector

**GEF AGENCIES:** EBRD

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** National Port Agency (ANP - Agence National de Ports)

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Climate Change

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's (EBRD) proposal "Enhancing the climate resilience of the Moroccan ports sector". The project objective relates clearly to adaptation benefits, the components are well-described, and the adaptation benefits and the addition cost reasoning are explicit. STAP appreciates the references to support the proposal's scientific/technical reasoning. The stakeholders' roles and their comparative advantages in the project are described well, including their potential role in scientific/technical matters (e.g. DHOC).

During the project development, STAP encourages the EBRD to consider the following aspects to further strengthen the proposal:

1. STAP wonders why all the SCCF funding is allocated to component 2 which constitutes structural measures while no funding is allocated for component 1 which aims to strengthen institutional capacity.
2. Component 2 supports infrastructure development. STAP highly encourages that EBRD explicitly defines the social and environmental safeguards it will put in place to mitigate any potential negative impacts. Further, it would be important to consider natural infrastructure in addition to the (hard) structural protection measures identified.
3. STAP recommends further detailing how the project will incorporate climate change projections to define the design wave heights, and impact on future sediment transport. In this respect, STAP notes the importance placed in recent scientific assessments (including the IPCC fifth assessment report) for risk-based decision-making. While a precautionary approach (page 41) is appropriate in many situations, explicit consideration of climate risks in a decision-analytic sense would provide greater clarity regarding benefits and costs of different options. Given the long life-times associated with infrastructural investments, it is important to consider both the possibility of mal-adaptation (due to infrastructure that is sub-optimal, or which has other negative consequences) or the possibility of inadequately considering the full range of climate risks.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is

	invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.  (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.  (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>