

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: June 18, 2015
Screener: Kristie Ebi
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:	5703
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Sudan
PROJECT TITLE:	Enhancing the Resilience of Communities Living in Climate Change Vulnerable Areas of Sudan Using Ecosystem Based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (ExA), Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources, Irrigation and Forestry of the White Nile State.
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 UNEP proposal "Enhancing the resilience of communities living in climate change vulnerable areas of Sudan using Ecosystem Based approaches to Adaptation (EbA)." The proposal aims to build the climate resilience of ecosystems and local communities in the White Nile State by improving their access to ecosystem services, and to increase the adaptive capacity of local communities by providing a buffer against extreme weather events. While the PIF is well developed, by focusing on only EbA, the proposed project carries a significant risk that it could increase infectious disease risk in the pilot communities. For example, there is long and unfortunate experience with small scale irrigation, rainwater harvesting, and fish production increasing morbidity and mortality from major killers of children, including malaria and diarrheal diseases. The STAP advisory for minor revision is primarily based on the need to ensure the project fully incorporates the need to protect and improve the health of the pilot communities. Given the risks, the Ministry of Health and other relevant health partners, including possibly representatives from the WHO and UNICEF country offices, should be among the critical stakeholders.

To further strengthen the project, STAP recommends addressing the following.

1. In the full proposal, STAP recommends including the criteria that will be used to select target sites and groups. STAP also recommends that project indicators be developed.
2. STAP welcomes the focus on women and other vulnerable groups and hopes the gender aspects will be further developed and specified in the full proposal.
3. Table 1 should be updated to include health risks associated with some of the proposed activities.

4. Also note that Table 1 says the risks of political volatility will be minimized by setting up the central project administration to limit the impact of government shifts. This appears to be somewhat inconsistent with the project goals to influence government policy. It would be helpful to understand how both will be achieved.

5. While not discussed, medium to longer-term adaptation options require consideration of projected changes in climate change, including extreme weather and climate events, and consideration of how development patterns could alter vulnerability. UNEP could consider developing regional scenarios including emission pathways (RCPs) and shared socioeconomic pathways (SSPs) that can inform identifying adaptation options robust against a range of future climates and societal changes. Further information on the development of these new climate scenarios can be found at <http://www2.cgd.ucar.edu/research/iconics>

<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: (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: (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. 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.