

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: May 09, 2013

Screeener: Guadalupe Duron

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: 5343

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Namibia

PROJECT TITLE: Scaling Up Community Resilience to Climate Variability and Climate Change in Northern Namibia, with a Special Focus on Women and Children.

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF), Regional Councils (RC), non-government entities, Traditional Authorities

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 revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNDP's proposal on "Scaling-up community resilience to climate variability and climate change in northern Namibia with a special focus on women and children". The project targets an important vulnerable segment of the population in a resource-limited region facing significant climate change impacts. The project components appear to support the overall objective of the SCCF. Furthermore, the objective consistently relates to the problem statement. STAP also is pleased with several innovative features, including the focus on women and youth orphaned by HIV/AIDs. These two population groups are possibly the most vulnerable to climate change based on the assumption that they are likely to own fewer resources to help them cope with climate change risks. In this regard, STAP is pleased that a comprehensive gender assessment will be undertaken in the targeted regions.

To strengthen further the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the points below.

1. STAP believes it would be helpful to have a more detailed characterization of the range of future climate change outcomes for the region of interest. Some relevant information from the Second National Communication (2011) is provided, but in addition to precipitation, variables such as soil moisture and projected stream flows in the border rivers are also relevant.

2. This is a typical multi-stressor situation, where climate (change or variability) is only one of the risks that the vulnerable populations face. Coping with climate risks may not be sufficient to address the underlying economic difficulties of small-holder agriculture. Therefore, STAP recommends a greater emphasis on understanding, and addressing the linkages between different sources of risk for longer-term resilience / adaptation.

3. The Green Scheme, the Rain-fed Crop Production programme and the Food/Cash for work programme are the main baseline activities that the project seeks to make more climate-resilient. Unfortunately, the project does not clearly indicate how it proposes to modify or enhance these baseline activities. Rather, the PIF talks about scaling up pilot interventions from the SPA and CBA projects.

4. It would be desirable to further consider questions of sustainability, viability and replicability with regard to the proposed interventions. As mentioned earlier, it is not clear how the proposed project would lead to changes in the baseline activities (or would be mainstreamed within them). Market creation for dryland agriculture products is important, but is a challenging prospect.

5. Box 2 of the PIF lists some innovations from the GEF SGP and SPA projects. The viability and suitability of these innovations in the context of future climate change needs to be carefully assessed. In the case of cash crops, market volatility can be an additional source of risk for small farmers.
6. In the project overview (section A), STAP recommends defining the project sites. Currently, these do not appear to be defined explicitly in the proposal. Furthermore, STAP suggests including climate variability, or projection, data that may be available for the targeted regions. One possible source of information for this data include “<http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm> and UNDP's climate change country profiles “<http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/> Likewise, it would be valuable to include socio-economic data for the targeted regions, if available. This information will help characterize further why the targeted population is vulnerable to climate change, and why their dependence on agriculture (including livestock) is vital to their livelihoods; thereby, to reducing their vulnerability to climate change.
7. Similarly, it would be valuable to provide further information on farmers' knowledge on adaptive capacity in the project region. For example, farmers appear to rely on their agro-ecological knowledge in parts of north-central Namibia to help them decide what crops to plant and where, and what grazing preferences to follow amidst climate variability and risks such as drought and floods. The project developers may wish to rely on the following paper to address this STAP suggestion “Newsham, A. and Thomas, D. "Knowing, farming and climate change adaptation in north-central Namibia". *Global Environmental Change* 21 (2011) 761-770.
8. While the associated baseline projects and the proposed adaptation activities provide a good basis for the additional cost reasoning, STAP wishes to see further specificity on the adaptation measures and how these will contribute to adaptation benefits in Outcome 1. For example, STAP suggests specifying further the climate-resilient land management practices the project will strengthen, and scale-up. In this regard, it would be useful to specify how these practices will build-upon farmers' agro-ecological knowledge and adaptive capacity to climate change risks, such as drought and floods. How will the climate-resilient land management practices contribute to decreasing farmers' vulnerability to climate risks characterized by droughts and floods? This information may assist in defining more explicitly the adaptation benefit(s) associated with these interventions.
9. STAP notes the proposal will build-on the outcomes from other initiatives on water harvesting detailed in outcome 2. Similar to outcome 1, STAP suggest detailing further the rationale for this intervention and outcomes based the population's socioeconomic characteristics (including water harvesting needs) as well as on climate vulnerability, or projection, data. For example, it would be valuable to detail further the interventions (restoration of wells and establishing new wells), and its rationale based on the water harvesting needs, or adaptive capacity needs of the population at risk. This will help to specify the adaptation benefit(s) affiliated with this intervention and its expected outcome(s).
10. STAP is pleased the proposal intends to use a quasi-experimental design methodology. STAP supports this approach, particularly as it will achieve an impact evaluation and eliminate rival explanations for the observed data; thereby, attributing confidently effects to the project. STAP wishes to recommends its publication to the project developers on "Experimental project designs in the global environmental facility “designing projects to create evidence and catalyze investments to secure global environmental benefits" (P.Ferraro. 2012) for the purpose of designing the methodology. The paper can be found at “<http://stapgef.org/multi-focal-area>
11. It is good to see that the project seeks to reinstate and replicate traditional knowledge (Box 3 of the PIF) for water resource management.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.

<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <p>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>
--	---