

# 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: June 18, 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:	8009
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Nepal
PROJECT TITLE:	Ecosystem-Based Adaptation for Climate-resilient Development in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Kathmandu Valley Development Authority (KVDA)
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 "Ecosystem-based adaptation for climate-resilient development in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal." The proposal aims to build the capacity to find cost-effective and concrete solutions for integrating adaptation, particularly ecosystem-based adaptation, into social and economic development. Adaptation interventions are needed to reduce exposure to frequent climate-related disasters, to support investments in developing urban infrastructure to increase climate resilience, and to reduce the vulnerability of urban populations and indigenous and local communities in Kathmandu Valley.

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. The PIF states in multiple places that the proposed project will increase resilience to climate change. 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.
3. The PIF states in multiple places that cost-effective adaptation options will be selected / recommended. It would be helpful to understand who will decide that options are cost-effective over what time periods, assuming which scenarios of climate change and development. It would be appropriate to evaluate whether EbA is more cost-effective in this context than other adaptation options.

4. In Component 1, it would be helpful to specify who will conduct training activities and orientation programs. It also would be helpful to provide criteria for how strategies, policies, and plans will be reviewed.
5. In the section in Component 1 on the adaptation scenario, it is stated that roadmaps for climate-resilient development will be integrated into strategies, policies, and plans in a continuous, progressive, and iterative manner. It would be helpful to understand how this will be achieved.
6. In Component 3, it would be helpful to specify who will develop technical guidance, and who will select, prioritize, and implement interventions, including the criteria that will be used.
7. In the section in Component 3 on the adaptation scenario, STAP would appreciate understanding how soil bioengineering, vegetation, crops, and plants will be assessed to determine the extent to which it could be resilient to future weather patterns.
8. STAP cautions that some of the examples of ecosystem based adaptation, such as rainwater harvesting, could increase rates of vectorborne and waterborne diseases. It would be important for the project to include the Ministry of Health as a key stakeholder and to possibly include a health expert to consult on adverse health consequences of different types of agricultural infrastructure. Further, the technical training could include a component to raise awareness of the potential health impacts of adaptation activities in agriculture.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. STAP appreciates the proposed youth competition for identifying and prioritizing interventions, and looks forward to more details in the full proposal.
12. STAP appreciates the efforts to identifying related projects and entry points for coordination with the proposed project.
13. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including the amount of human and financial resources required.
14. STAP appreciates the intention to include gender considerations throughout the proposed project and the indicators that will be monitored. STAP looks forward to development of this aspect in the full proposal.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	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.
<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.</p> <p>(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</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major

<b>to be considered during project design</b>	<p>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> <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>
---	--