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: October 18, 2012 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information (Copied from the PIF)

FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5105 **PROJECT DURATION**: 5 **COUNTRIES**: Tunisia

PROJECT TITLE: Addressing Climate Change Vulnerabilities and Risks in Vulnerable Coastal Areas of Tunisia

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment, Coastal Protection and Planning Agency (APAL)

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): Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the proposal "Addressing Climate Change Vulnerabilities and Risks in Vulnerable Coastal Areas of Tunisia" by UNDP. The complexity of the climate change threats to socioeconomic development in Tunisia are articulated clearly and comprehensively. STAP values the references to literature along with the data describing the coastal landscape, Tunisia's socioeconomic composition, and the climate change projections for the region. Furthermore, the proposed interventions are defined in detail, and support the intended project objective. The same holds true for the additional cost reasoning.

To further strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends UNDP address the following comments during the preparation of the full proposal –

- 1. Under the baseline and problem statement, STAP believes the range of climate change induced sea level rise (SLR) of 38 50 cm (page 8, paragraph 7) seems low, and perhaps does not reflect the full range of possible SLR outcomes. A risk management perspective would advocate for consideration of the full range of uncertainty. Further, STAP recommends considering to what extent subsidence is human-induced (for example, ground-water removal), or geological.
- 2. Hard protective structures may well be mal-adaptive; however, this will need to be assessed and established (paragraph 10, page 9).
- 3. There are good economic reasons for tourism and infrastructure development in coastal regions. The choice between coastal protection and exposure reduction needs to be done in an equitable, economically reasonable and sociopolitically acceptable manner; it is therefore not automatic that minimizing exposure and relocation is necessarily the only; or best option (paragraph 11, page 10). Therefore, as the proposal indicates (page 13); suitable planning approaches are those that allow for the examination of a portfolio of options and consideration of trade-offs.
- 4. STAP welcomes the inclusion of ecosystem-based, "soft" infrastructure options for shoreline protection. They may be considered more fully, particularly given the co-benefits associated with such options.
- 5. Similar to the LDCF/SCCF Secretariat, the STAP believes in encouraging a clearly-defined results based management framework "...to enable the GEF and the Conference of the Parties to assess how the SCCF interventions contributed towards the adaptation goals." (GEF/LDCF/SCCF.9/Inf.4) Therefore, STAP wishes to encourage UNDP to define explicitly the baseline during the proposal development (if possible, rooted on scientific evidence), as well as

how it will be measured and monitored during the project implementation. Equally, STAP encourages a more explicit definition of the adaptation benefits, including indicators for each benefit to monitor the adaptation outcomes.

6. STAP recommends describing how gender will be imbedded throughout the proposed interventions. Currently, gender is not raised in the proposal. Therefore, it would be valuable to identify how gender-related issues which may arise in implementation will be addressed. One resource could be UNDP's "Gender, Climate Change and Community Based Adaptation Guidebook", UNDP, 2010, or an additional UNDP gender and climate change guideline tool. UNDP also may wish to consider "Gender and climate change â€" 3 things you should know" by the World Bank (2011) as a reference on the gender-related effects of climate change.

STAP advisory response		Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1.	Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.
		Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
2.	Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.
	·	Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3.	Major revision required	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up:
		 (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.