

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 11, 2015

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: 5814

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Tonga)

PROJECT TITLE: Pacific Resilience Program

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Finance of Tonga and Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)

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 World Bank's proposal "Pacific Resilience Program" for the Pacific Islands (regional), Tonga. The proposed project aims to build resilience of communities vulnerable to climate related disaster risks, through implementation of the following three main project components: (1) strengthening early warning and preparedness, (2) mainstreaming climate and disaster risk into development, through prioritized investments in resilience and retro-fitting of key public assets, and (3) improving post-disaster response capacity of countries through disaster risk financing. While, the PID document and the PCN data sheet describe the overall project objective and basic framework for each of the three project components; more detailed information and justification particularly about the adaptation benefits and the additional cost reasoning would have been helpful.

STAP recommends that the following points be addressed during the development of the proposal to further strengthen the scientific and technical underpinnings:

- In Component One of the PID, the stated objective is to increase resilience of countries to natural hazards such as cyclones, coastal/riverine flooding, volcanic eruptions, tsunamis and earthquakes by improving the quality of forecasting and warning services, as well as preparedness. While recognizing the value of a multi-hazard approach, for the purpose of the SCCF, the STAP requests the World Bank to further elaborate specifically on the climate induced hazards and the proposed adaptation benefits.

- Under Component Two, it is stated that support will be used to retrofit key public assets, such as school buildings to act as evacuation centers. During the project preparation, it is recommended that consideration be given to the projected increase in design wind speeds with projected increases in cyclone severity due to climate change. Any retrofitting activities should consider projected changes in cyclone severity to ensure that climate change projections are included. Similarly, it is recommended to ensure that school buildings are located outside of inundation areas, considering both projected sea level rise and increases in the severity of storm surge flooding.

- Similar to the above comment, under Component Two of the project, there is a need to ensure that not only are current disaster risks addressed, but that projected changes in climate and their impacts on disaster risk (changes to frequency, severity, etc) is adequately incorporated. In this regard, it would be helpful to

elaborate the generation of appropriate climate and socio-economic scenarios “ that will allow the project to explore a range of climate projections.

- STAP notes that under component three of the project, SCCF funds will be used to support continuation of the PCRAFI insurance scheme. It would be helpful to elaborate the strategy for the continuation / sustainability of such risk transfer / risk retention mechanisms beyond the life of the project.

<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> <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>