

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 17, 2014

Screener: Kristie Ebi

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: 5723

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Regional (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia)

PROJECT TITLE: West Balkans Drina River Basin Management Project

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:

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 World Bank proposal "West Balkans Drina Basin Management" for Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, and Montenegro. The proposal aims to enhance multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in transboundary Drina waters, while mainstreaming climate adaptation measures; develop a shared vision and technical cooperation framework, including a strategic action plan for more sustainable and balanced investments; and enhance capacity for joint ecosystem-based management of Drina River Basin and for adaptation to climate-induced economic losses. The PIDC provides a broad outline of the intended activities of what will be a complex project with components funded by different agencies.

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

1. The STAP recommends moving beyond general descriptions of the vulnerability of the Drina River Basin to climate variability and change to providing data and information on impacts of floods and droughts, and to including projections of how extreme weather and climate events may change under different scenarios of climate and development (for example, in paragraphs 5 and 9).
2. It would be helpful to include a flow chart to show the relationships between the various project components, including which agency will support different activities. Further, it would be helpful to include a description of mechanisms for ensuring coordination and collaboration across the funders.
3. It would be helpful to have a short annex summarizing the regional policy dialogues and strategic and sector analyses, including assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of various management scenarios; the assessment of the basin's vulnerability to climate change; and the prioritization of capacity building interventions.
4. Under component 1, the STAP recommends including more description of the modelling that will be developed, including the scenarios that will be used and the rationale for the choices made. In particular, it would be helpful to describe the model that will be used and the necessary modifications to increase the relevance of the results. Further, the STAP suggests using where possible the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) being developed as part of the new climate change scenario process; these describe a range of possible development pathways, including qualitative descriptions and quantitative variables such as demographic growth, education, and GDP <http://www.isp.ucar.edu/iconics>. Although the SSPs are

described on the global scale, several EU projects were recently initiated to develop regional extensions that could provide input for the descriptions of future socio-economic-environmental conditions used in the project.

5. As noted in the PCN review meeting, the STAP recommends further consideration of the possible impacts of climate change on groundwater, to further promote resilience.
6. The STAP would appreciate further information under sub-component 1B, including not only which agencies and ministries will be members of the Drina Task Force and the national inter-ministerial committees, but also the intended structure and operation of these committees / task force.
7. Similarly, under sub-component 2A, it would be helpful to have further description of who will be involved in the small grants program and how decisions will be taken on which grants to support, to help ensure the grants are focused on promoting adaptation.
8. The STAP recommends further information on sub-component 2B, including a more detailed description of the flood forecasting and early warning system (including response activities), including how it will be designed to increase resilience to changes in the frequency and intensity of extreme weather and climate events; and specifics of the pilot activities to increase resilience. Too little detail is provided in this sub-component to understand what the SCCF will fund, including how the activities will be undertaken, who will be engaged, the indicators that will be established to measure the degree of success, how the activities could promote up-scaling, and how sustainability will be determined.
9. In paragraph 38, STAP recommends including more information on not only who will be included in the various teams, but also how those agencies/individuals will be selected.
10. Section IV notes safeguard policies that may apply, but not how they would be applied (if needed) for this project.
11. The STAP notes that one of the project goals is to "enhance capacity for joint ecosystem-based management of Drina River Basin and for adaptation to climate-induced economic losses". However, there is limited information in the PIDC addressing how that goal will be accomplished.
12. STAP also notes several explicit and implicit suggestions that further hydropower capacity will likely be built. Given the risks associated with climate change, it would be of interest to include capacity building specifically to assess the risks and benefits of this additional capacity in the context of a changing climate, and to assess how additional capacity could be build while safeguarding terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.
13. STAP recommends providing specific information on how gender will be taken into consideration in project implementation. It would be helpful to include criteria for ensuring women are included in project activities, to specify how gender-differentiated activities would be designed, and to include indicators for monitoring the success of these activities for women.
14. STAP recommends including information on the stakeholders who would be engaged in project implementation. In addition to those named or implied, possible stakeholders include the ministry of tourism, the ministry of health and WHO country offices (to ensure project activities improve the quality of drinking water), disaster risk management agencies, and administrators for critical infrastructure.
15. STAP assumes the full project proposal will include detailed information on the activities to be implemented, the location of pilot projects, numbers of pieces of equipment purchased, the numbers of individuals trained, the timeline to be followed, and how the progress of the project will be monitored and evaluated.
16. Other issues include:
 - a. A list of acronyms would be helpful.
 - b. Including references for statements of fact would be helpful.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
-------------------------------	---

<p>1. Consent</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>2. Minor revision required.</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.