

# 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: February 02, 2016  
Screener: Kristie Ebi  
Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan  
Consultant(s): Sarah Lebel

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	6984
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Nepal, Timor Leste)
PROJECT TITLE:	Building Resilience of Health Systems in Asian LDCs to Climate Change
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	WHO
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 "Building Resilience of Health Systems in Asian LDCs to Climate Change". The project aims to strengthen institutional capacity to handle the impacts of climate change on the health sector in the following Asian LDCs: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao, Myanmar, Nepal, and Timor Leste. It also aims to build a network of regional cooperation to share knowledge and experience, as well as establish information-generation structures and early warning systems to deliver more effective health services. STAP found the PIF to be generally sound from a scientific and technical perspective, yet identified a number of issues which could be addressed when further developing the project. These are listed below.

1. In screening the PIF, STAP found little to no mention of expected/projected changes in climatic patterns in the future. The climate proofing of healthcare services and infrastructure will require a more in-depth understanding of climate change projections for the areas of concern in this project. STAP recommends that a range of climate scenarios be considered, with appropriate use of the CMIP5 datasets used in the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report. STAP would also encourage the use or consideration of shared socio-economic pathways (SSPs) in the preparation of the NAP, to get a better grasp of climate change impacts and their associated costs in a broader socio-economic context. Further details can be found here: <https://www2.cgd.ucar.edu/research/iconics/publications/ssps>
2. When linking this project with UNDP and WHO co-financing initiatives, it will be important to clearly identify how these relate to climate change. For instance, what are the specific added risks of climate change for groups with HIV, when establishing links with the South-Asia HIV Programme?
3. STAP welcomes the emphasis on marginalized groups, and would suggest developing a systematic way of engaging with marginalized groups (including women groups), throughout the project. While not all groups may need to be involved at all stages of the project, it will be important to conduct a thorough assessment of the relevant stakeholders prior to engaging with the project further. This will be particularly important here, judging from the scale and ambition of the project.
4. The value-added of a regional approach is not fully brought out in the PIF. To what extent is cross-border disease spread important from a surveillance standpoint? For countries that share a common river

basin such as Cambodia and Lao PDR – there may be some advantages. However, for other countries (Nepal, Timor Leste) there are no obvious relationships or synergies (outcome 4.1 is somewhat vague). 5. While STAP welcomes the creation of H-NAP's and the integration with the NAP process in the countries, it is important to reflect on the baseline of public health systems in the countries, and that substantial in-country capacity development may be needed before taking up a H-NAP. Further, the linkage of health systems and climate monitoring systems is important – however, in most countries in the project both these elements are likely to need strengthening in themselves (outcome 2.1).

<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.  (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 to be considered during project design</b>	<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>