

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 15, 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:	6989
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Nepal
PROJECT TITLE:	Developing climate resilient livelihoods in the vulnerable watershed in Nepal
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Department of Soil Conservation and Watershed Management, Ministry of Forestry and Soil Conservation
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 UNDP proposal "Developing climate resilient livelihoods in the vulnerable watershed of Nepal." The proposal aims to rehabilitate and maintain functional integrity of watersheds that have critical functions of water storage and release, infiltration, drainage control, and soil moisture retention.

STAP looks forward to further details in the full proposal. Issues that should be addressed in the full proposal include:

1. STAP hopes that the context for this project has not deteriorated as a consequence of the recent earthquake.
2. STAP appreciates the efforts to identifying related projects and entry points for coordination with the proposed project. It would be helpful to map the projects to have a visual overview of what is being implemented where.
3. Component 1 appears quite ambitious, so STAP looks forward to further details in the full proposal on what outcomes and outputs will be implemented. It would be helpful to know how the geophysical and hydrological assessments, and institutional, legal, and socioeconomic conditions will be reviewed; the methods that will be used; and the criteria that will be used for evaluation. It also would be helpful to have further information on the methods and tools that will be deployed; the hydrological and hydro-economic models that will be used; how observations and modelling capacities will be strengthened / established; and how payments for ecosystem services will be modified and enforced. Similarly, it would be helpful to understand the approaches that will be taken to modify guidelines and frameworks, and how climate change over coming decades will be taken into account.

4. STAP would appreciate fuller details on which climate change projections will be used, 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. It also would be helpful to incorporate different possible future socioeconomic development pathways (e.g. Shared Socioeconomic Pathways) when considering which adaptation options could be more resilient in coming decades.

5. Component 2 states it will be partially based on comprehensive risk and vulnerability assessments; will these be conducted as part of the proposed project? Similarly to Component 1, much further detail is needed for Component 2. STAP cautions that some of the examples of possible interventions could increase rates of vectorborne and waterborne diseases. It would be helpful for the project to include a health expert to consult on possible adverse health consequences of proposed interventions. Page 10 mentions outputs 2.3 and 2.4 although specific outputs are not described in the PIF.

6. STAP looks forward to further specification of how private funding will be used to compensate communities for stewardship of watershed services.

7. Given the potential health risks, it could be helpful to include the Ministry of Health among the key stakeholders. It was surprising that ICIMOD was not listed as a potential partner. In the stakeholder table, there is a question about whether to include a FAO LDCF project under development; it would be helpful to include what information is available in the full proposal.

8. STAP looks forward to information in the full proposal on indicators for monitoring and evaluating the activities that will be undertaken during the project, and for measuring the benefit of the interventions. STAP also looks forward to more information on how best practices and lessons learned will be identified, including the criteria to be used and who will do the identification.

9. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including the amount of human and financial resources required.

10. STAP appreciates the inclusion of gender considerations throughout the proposed project. STAP looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full proposal.

<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	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>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	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>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> <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>
--	---