

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 29th September 2009

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information

GEF PROJECT ID: 3999

COUNTRY(IES): BRAZIL

PROJECT TITLE: THIRD NATIONAL COMMUNICATION TO THE UNFCCC

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): CLIMATE CHANGE

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): ENABLING ACTIVITIES

II. STAP Advisory Response (see table below for explanation)

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP commends the work of Brazil for initiating Third National Communication, as it is completing the SNC. We also welcome Brazil's work in proposing very intensive studies on GHG inventory, vulnerability and adaptation and in particular the focus on regional modelling. A few minor suggestions could be considered.

- IPCC LULUCF Good Practice Guidance, 2003: We presume that Brazil will use GPG approach to land use sectors, given the importance of land use sectors for Brazil.
- It will be good to highlight the limitations of and lessons learnt from preparation of National Communications observed during FNC and SNC.
- We presume that Brazil will carry out Key Category Analysis based on FNC and SNC to identify the key categories for inventory estimation. We also recommend adoption of higher tiers for the key categories.
- Given the technical capacity of Brazil we suggest attempts to reduce uncertainty and estimate the uncertainty of GHG emission estimation.
- We hope that by the time TNC is complete sustained institutional arrangements and capacity will be established for GHG inventory and vulnerability assessments.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Consent | STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement. |
| 2. Minor revision required. | STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing 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 revision required | STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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. |