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:	April 03, 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:	9750
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Haiti
PROJECT TITLE:	Resilient Productive Landscapes in Haiti
GEF AGENCIES:	World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development, Ministry of Economy and Finance
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):
Major issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

This project "Resilient Productive Landscapes in Haiti" outlines the problems, sets principal objectives, and specifies activities to address the situation in Haiti in general, and, in particular, after the 2015 drought and 2016 hurricane. However in STAP's view, the project appears to be outside the scope of the LDCF, with regard to the main thematic coverage, key directions, problem framing, and target specifications.

STAP is concerned that the project is proposed under the LDCF because its aim is unclear. This is variously said to be to "examine the agriculture/environment nexus and apply a sustainable management approach across the landscape" (p. 4), or to work towards the common goals of "a) improving the quality of soil and vegetation, b) increasing tree canopy cover, c) promoting the use of sustainable agro-forestry and renewable energy, and d) strengthening the overall preservation and protection of forests through alleviation of poverty and development of alternative livelihoods for communities" (p. 8), or "to restore ecosystem services at a watershed level to safeguard and enhance agricultural production, reduce vulnerability of economic and ecological systems to external shocks, and to strengthen capacities for the long-term sustainable management of those landscapes beyond the project intervention area" (p. 12).

The primary objective of the project appears to be damage restoration after the recent natural disasters, and enhancing the resilience of agriculture and ecosystems in selected watersheds, and improving the Government's capacities in emergency response. If successful, the proposed project would probably mitigate the future vulnerability of agriculture to climate change, but this seems to be a secondary, albeit positive, outcome.

The PIF does not present any information on which the proposal's merits as a climate change adaptation project could be evaluated - no climate change scenarios, no possible impacts, and no vulnerability assessments. There is neither a baseline, nor an alternative scenario specified (climate change adaptation). The proposed components outline objectives and list activities, but do not specify outcomes and outputs.

There is no mention of adaptation benefits and linkages to NAPA. The scientific and technical foundations of the PIF as a climate change adaptation project are therefore absent.

If the proposed project were to be implemented successfully (financed from an appropriate fund), it might be possible to prepare and implement an LDCF climate change vulnerability and adaptation project to reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity.

As presented in the PIF and the PNC, STAP is therefore unable to assess the scientific and technical soundness of the project, because there is an insufficient rationale to warrant funding under the LDCF. STAP would be happy to screen the next iteration of the proposal before it is sent for CEO endorsement.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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.