

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: March 09, 2015
Screener: Kristie Ebi
Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan
Consultant(s):

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

| FULL SIZE PROJECT | LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND |
|----------------------------------|---|
| GEF PROJECT ID: | 6983 |
| PROJECT DURATION: | 4 |
| COUNTRIES: | Mozambique |
| PROJECT TITLE: | Mozambique: Building Resilience in the Coastal Zone through Ecosystem Based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA). |
| GEF AGENCIES: | UNEP |
| OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: | MICOA |
| 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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNEP proposal "Building resilience in the coastal zone through ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation (EbA)." The proposal aims to increase the climate change resilience of vulnerable communities in the larger Maputo, Mozambique area that depend on ecosystem services provided by mangrove and riparian ecosystems. STAP looks forward to further details in the full proposal. Issues that should be addressed in the full proposal include:

1. STAP would appreciate fuller details on which climate change projections will be used in the proposed project, including the time frame(s) of interest and why particular model(s) were chosen. It would be helpful to know who will choose the models and how the projections will be communicated to the stakeholders.
2. The full project proposal should provide further information on the criteria for selecting the interventions that will be implemented, including how the capacity to provide ecosystem services in the future with a different climate will be determined. Additional information also should be provided on how community needs and preferences will be determined and taken into account in the project outputs.
3. The PIF makes several mentions of previous problems with cholera and malaria outbreaks from consumption of untreated water, and states that the interventions will reduce those risks. It would be helpful to understand how the interventions will increase access to treated water and reduce disease outbreaks. Given the burden of these diseases, it will be important to ensure close cooperation with relevant departments in the Ministry of Health. STAP suggests including a health expert when developing the protocols for interventions, and including a representative from the Ministry of Health in the cross-sectoral dialogue committee.
4. STAP suggests providing additional information on how it will be determined that the recommended species to be planted will be resilient to further climate change and the time frame for that assessment.

5. STAP appreciates the intention to ensure the interventions are cost-effective, and environmentally and socially applicable. It would be helpful for the full project proposal to include information on how these will be assessed and evaluated, and by whom.
6. The International Federation of Red Cross / Red Crescent Societies is another potential stakeholder.
7. The full project proposal should include a detailed description of the plan for developing a long-term research program, including how it would be funded, administered, and evaluated.
8. The PIF indicates strong stakeholder engagement, which will no doubt increase the potential for success of the proposed project. UNEP might consider moving towards a co-production of knowledge model, where in addition to training and consulting with stakeholders, stakeholders become partners in the interventions. Doing so could reduce, for example, the high risk of resistance of stakeholders to the interventions by creating local spokespersons.
9. It would be valuable for full project proposal to include information on how the project will coordinate with on-going initiatives.
10. STAP appreciates the efforts to include gender into the proposed project, and looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full project proposal, including how it will be determined that activities will be gender-sensitive.
11. STAP also appreciates the PIF noting that an up-scaling activity will be developed, looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full project proposal.
12. In Annex II, note that the "Adaptation interventions supported by the proposed LDCF project" are the same for all goals. This makes it difficult to match up the hazards, risks, and benefits with the relevant interventions.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|---|---|
| 1. Concur | In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement. |
| 2. Minor issues to be considered during project design | <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> |
| 3. Major issues to be considered during project design | <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 GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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. |
|--|--|