

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: @@@@ @@, @@@@
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	8018
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)
PROJECT TITLE:	Building Resilience of Health Systems in Pacific Island 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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Building Resilience of Health Systems in Pacific Island LDCs to Climate Change". The project aims to integrate climate change risk and resilience into health governance, health information management, and the delivery of health services.

While the aims of the project are commendable, and its focus on vulnerable small island LDC's is welcome, the PIF does not adequately provide the scientific basis for the proposed interventions, which are rather generic in nature. The particular context and vulnerabilities of the Pacific islands ought to be better captured, as should the possible interactions between current health issues (which include non-climate related diet and lifestyle issues) with climate driven health risks (such as changes in vector-borne disease). Further, it would have been helpful to identify the key health risks associated with future climate change "though STAP recognizes that this is something that would emerge as a part of project development. For example, a recent paper (McIver, Lachlan, Alistair Woodward, Seren Davies, Tebikau Tibwe, and Steven Iddings. "Assessment of the health impacts of climate change in Kiribati." International journal of environmental research and public health 11, no. 5 (2014): 5224-5240), provides a nice assessment of climate and health issues in Kiribati.

It would be helpful for the project developers to answer the following questions early on in project development: What are the intended measures to assess the impacts of climate change on human health, and how can identifying them help prioritize interventions? What will be the actual importance of climate change adaptation in the revised national-level strategic plans on health? This relates directly to component #3, for instance. While it is certainly appropriate to consider the "climate-proofing" of existing health infrastructure assets (such as hospitals), there is a larger question of the nature of appropriate health infrastructure in light of the impacts of climate change on human health, and the potentially changing needs in health services.

Moreover, given that WHO is one of the executing agencies for the project, it would have been helpful to refer to the key insights from their 2010-2012 project supporting eleven Pacific island countriesâ€”including Kiribatiâ€” which assessed their vulnerability to climate change and compiled national health adaptation strategies to manage those risks to health.

Finally, the logic of a "regional" project that targets multiple countries, and the benefits of such an approach, is not fully developed. Component #4 does talk about South-South cooperation, but it would have been helpful to outline the benefits of this regional approach beyond the obvious sharing of experiences and practices.

As a result of these observations, STAP's advisory response is "minor revision" â€” to ensure that the observations are adequately addressed during project development.

<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: <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>
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: <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>