

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: December 08, 2015
Screener: Thomas Hammond
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:	5867
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Senegal
PROJECT TITLE:	Promoting Innovative Finance and Community Based Adaptation in Communes Surrounding Community Natural Reserves (Ferlo, Niokolo Koba, Senegal River Bas Delta & Saloum Delta), Senegal
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment & Sustainable development (MEDD)
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 "Promoting innovative finance and community based adaptation in communes surrounding community natural reserves (Ferlo, Niokolo Koba, Senegal river Bas Delta & Saloum Delta), Senegal". The proposed project aims to reduce the vulnerability of local communities to the impacts of climate change by introducing innovative financing mechanisms, at local and community scales, to address the incremental costs of adaptation.

While the objective of the project is unexceptionable, and it fits well with relevant national objectives and plans, the PIF is quite sketchy in its presentation of the intervention logic, and in clearly identifying how the LDCF intervention will reshape the baselines to enhance climate resilience. While STAP's overall advisory response is "minor revision", STAP believes that there are significant weaknesses in the PIF that would need to be adequately and comprehensively addressed during the course of project development.

The first concern is the lack of detail on the proposed intervention modalities. On page 4, the PIF talks about creating "innovative financing mechanisms" to support "climate change governance at communes level" – however, it is not clear what they are; how they would differ (if at all) from the current credit & savings mutuels and what "climate change governance" means. There is considerable history and work on micro-finance in West Africa – and in other countries and there are many barriers to accessing and using financial instruments such as micro-credits. It is not clear how the proposed intervention would strengthen the existing mechanisms and help them address issues relevant for long-term adaptation.

A second concern is that the PIF does not draw an adequate connection between the proposed interventions and the source of the communities' vulnerability to climate change – which lies in the vulnerability & degradation of the natural resource base. The creation of community natural reserves

appears to be a key step for improving the management and condition of the natural resource base. How would this approach be modified to help address climate variability and climate change?

The PIF fails to clearly justify from a science perspective why and how the selected communities will be facing increased risks under a changing climate. Addressing this issue should be prioritized in the project preparation phase.

The following additional observations may also be considered to strengthen the project:

1. Identify climate impacts based on the latest projections (e.g. IPCC AR5), with a time horizon relevant to project-planning. It is currently unclear how a 3% change in annual precipitation by the 2090s could significantly increase risks and vulnerability for the concerned communities. Correctly identifying risks brought on by a changing climate will help better target interventions both in terms of location/identification of target communities, and funding priorities.
2. The project should aim to build and learn from the already existing 9 credit and savings mutuals currently helping to improve living conditions of households with a focus on women. It is unclear how such learning will be integrated into the project design to focus on resilience building, but also how this relates to expected output 2.4 (Mechanisms for capturing and dissemination key experiences & good practices established for replication).
3. STAP values the large focus given to the inclusion of numerous stakeholders, and in particular to women groups and youth. STAP also encourages the involvement of other local partners, including universities, to support capacity-building with regards to climate information and knowledge management (Expected outputs 2.3) and reduce the risk of the inappropriate assignment of funds due to a lack of understanding of local climate impacts, risks, and adaptation priorities.

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. 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 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. 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>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>

