

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: 6 March 2008

Screener: Anthony Nyong and Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Anthony Nyong

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3101

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 2162

COUNTRY(IES): Government of the Cook Islands, Federated States

of Micronesia, Fiji, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu, Marshall Islands, Palau

PROJECT TITLE: Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: None

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

Full size project **SCCF/LDCF**

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Minor Revision Required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. Some of the 'output's of the project are indeed outcomes. For instance, 'Technical capacity of key decision makers developed' is an outcome. It is difficult to see how some of the outcomes will be achieved. There are no clear activities to support the emergence of the outcomes. For instance, it does not mention how the technical capacity of decision makers will be developed or how economic cost of adaptation will be developed. The proposal is silent on baselines upon which this project will build on and be assessed.

It does appear that not all 13 SIDS listed in the project have 'national relevance' as listed in the section on the consistency of the project with national priorities/plans. For instance, some countries such as Tuvalu and Vanuatu, Palau and Marshall Islands are missing. Also, some of the activities that the project will complement in some of the countries are quite vague. For instance, 'Tonga's Strategic Development Plan forms the basis of the proposed activity in that country'. It would be better to have an idea of some of the specific issues that this project will fund and to see how they all add up to achieving the project's objectives.

On risks, the proposal should identify the existing limited capacity in many of these countries and show how it tends to manage this to ensure the successful implementation of the project in these countries.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review 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.
3. Major revision	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in

required	<p>the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.</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>
-----------------	--