

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 08, 2011

Screener: Lev Neretin

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

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4619

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Colombia

PROJECT TITLE: Third National Communication to the UNFCCC

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM)

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 provides consent for the 3rd National Communication's PIF of Columbia. Columbia needs to be complemented for initiating the 3rd National Communication process. Some of the following issues could be addressed during the next phase:

1. Technical, institutional and capacity gaps or barriers: Since two National Communications have been prepared, it is suggested to conduct a systematic assessment of the technical, institutional, capacity, data and modeling gaps or barriers. This would enable sustainability of the National Communication process as well as preparation of high quality reports. Some lessons and limitations have been listed. Lessons learned during from the preparation of the two NCs need to be incorporated during project preparation.
2. GHG inventory estimates for most countries are characterized by high uncertainties: PIF states that there was very high degree of uncertainty in the estimation of GHG inventory, in particular the LULUCF sector. The measures for reducing the uncertainties in GHG inventory with respect to Activity Data and Emission Factors for different sectors need to be addressed and incorporated. Which IPCC Guidelines will be used? STAP suggests exploring feasibility of adopting the IPCC-GPG, 2003 approach for LULUCF sector for reliable GHG estimates and for reducing the uncertainty in the estimates of GHG emissions and removals.
3. PThe IF states that climate projections will be made for 2050s and 2070s. It is suggested to make projections for 2020s and 2030s also for policy makers. New decadal projections are available for all the regions at finer scales. Models may have to be adopted for agriculture, water and forest sectors to assess the impacts of climate change even for the period of 2030s and 2050s.
4. Sustained QA/QC procedures need to be adopted to ensure reliability of estimates in the NC. Further, Key category analysis is needed along with adoption of higher tiers for GHG inventory for Key categories.

<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	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

<p>required.</p>	<p>that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <p>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.</p>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>