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: May 05, 2010 Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*
ENABLING ACTIVITY GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 4254
PROJECT DURATION :
COUNTRIES : Brazil
PROJECT TITLE: Mitigation Options of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions in Key Sectors in Brazil
GEF AGENCIES: UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Science and Technology
GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

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

This project aims at building technical capacity to assist the Brazilian Govt. in identification and implementation of mitigation actions as identified in the Brazilian policy and plan on climate change. This will be a very useful exercise and an assessment of mitigation opportunities and costs in different sectors will build a long-term foundation for the implementation of mitigation actions. STAP recommends that the following questions and suggestions are considered during the next steps of project development.

1. Structure of Mitigation assessment reports: IPCC has conducted sectoral assessment of mitigation potential at global and regional levels. The IPCC sectors include energy supply, transport, residential and commercial buildings, industry, agriculture, forestry, and waste management. Brazil could benefit by evaluating the IPCC sectoral approach as well as the structure of mitigation assessment chapters, while preparing the Mitigation assessment reports taking into account:
a. Status of the sector and emission trends;
b. Description and assessment of mitigation technologies, practices and options;
c. Estimation of mitigation potential for 2010, 2020, 2030 and 2050;
d. Estimation of costs;
e. Assessment of barriers, opportunities, policies and implementation issues;
f. Socio-economic and sustainable development implications;
g. Technology research, development, diffusion and transfer;
h. Long-term outlook.

2. National Communication: What is the link between this project and the 3rd National Communication of Brazil? Opportunities for synergy between these two projects could be explored.

3. Linking with LULUCF and agriculture sector: These two sectors dominate the GHG emissions in Brazil. Though these sectors are not included in this report and the reference is provided to complimentary work at the national level, clear links have to be built with the current project and certain level of integration achieved to obtain the full national picture. This information is requested at the CEO endorsement stage.

4. National Policy and climate change: Under which scenario of Component 1 will the National Policy and climate change actions would be incorporated? Will scenario A be a BAU scenario? Copenhagen Accord recognizes the need for limiting the warming to 2 degrees C and also aim at early peaking of GHG emissions. The project could extend the analysis to develop a better understanding of the feasibility of achieving these two goals applied to Brazil.

5. Generation of database: The project could also consider development of a good database on GHG emissions, mitigation technologies, cost, potential etc. at a decentralized level to assist future mitigation project development under CDM and other emerging mechanisms.

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