

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 30, 2017
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9723
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	South Sudan
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening the Capacity of Government and Communities in South Sudan to Adapt to Climate Change
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	UNEP PCDMB and SS and Ministry of Environment
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 UNEP proposal "Strengthening the capacity of government and communities in South Sudan to adapt to climate change". The project aims to use an Ecosystem-based Adaptation approach at the landscape level to increase the capacity of local communities and institutions in South Sudan to adapt to climate change. Overall, STAP believes the PIF is very well-developed, as well as scientifically and technically sound. In order to strengthen the project, STAP makes the following remarks and recommendations:

Recommendations:

1. In the Adaptation scenario in Component 2, the timing of establishing alternative livelihoods will be critical to bridge the gap between the restoration activities and the emergence of their results in order to prevent premature exploitation of restored ecosystems and thus disrupt the recovery process.
2. The list of stakeholders on page 20 is comprehensive, but in order to reduce the coordination burden, it might be practical to define a smaller core group including those stakeholders who could do most for the success of the project and who would benefit most from the project.
3. The fate of this project will depend on the success of efforts to mitigate conflicts and establish durable peace. In Component 1, the plan to refurbish the hydro-meteorological monitoring stations according to the needs of policy-making is essential, but strong safeguards/risk management strategies will need to be put in place.

Remarks:

1. The proposal presents a thorough diagnosis of the current situation in South Sudan, identifies the drivers degrading the natural resource base (page 4) and correctly concludes that prevailing socio-economic processes and natural resource management practices increase the vulnerability to climate change and undermine the adaptation potential (page 6). The situation is made worse by a range of barriers to vulnerability reduction and adaptation (page 5). As indicated in the baseline scenario, the GoSS has

- embarked on serious efforts to address current problems that, if successful, provide favourable conditions for implementing the alternative scenario under the proposed project.
2. STAP welcomes the presentation of climate information, which appears to have well informed the design of the project. Specifically, the recognition that natural assets such as forests can bring adaptation benefits, but are also themselves at risk under a changing climate, is important.
 3. The intended methodologies are appropriate and may work well.
 - a. The process of stakeholder engagement seems adequate.
 - b. The eloquent presentation of the meticulously developed theory of change deserves special acclaim, as does the detailed demonstration of the conformity of the proposed project with the guiding principles in the NAPA.
 - c. Transferring and adopting EbA to local conditions is an important innovation element of the proposed project. Asking participating communities to make in-kind contributions in flexible forms (labour, materials, other assets) is a clever idea to induce the sense of ownership for the project in the community.
 - d. The plans to mainstream gender issues in the project are well-conceived.
 - e. The risk assessment is comprehensive and the risk management actions are clearly presented. The countermeasures seem to be realistic and have a good chance to substantially reduce the various types of risks.
 - f. The KM plan appears adequate.

<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>