

# 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: 29<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4110

**COUNTRY(IES):** GLOBAL

**PROJECT TITLE:** NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE UNFCCC

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** UNDP AND UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** NATIONAL PARTNERS

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** CLIMATE CHANGE

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM:** SUPPORT TO ENABLING ACTIVITIES PROJECT FRAMEWORK

### 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

This is an enabling activity which aims to support national stock taking, stakeholder consultation, with the ultimate goal of improving the national communications prepared by the non-annex I countries. There is a lack of clarity on the project components, outcomes and the activities proposed in the project. In section A of Part-II, the issues to be addressed are not clear. It only highlights the need for sustaining NC preparation, capacity building. There may be clarity among the project implementing agencies (UNDP and UNEP), however, it may not be clear to other Agencies. Clarification is recommended as follows:

#### Component I:

- It is not clear how the proposed project will contribute to improving the national communication. Does it aim to assist the ongoing projects or does it aim to assist preparation of improved proposals for the next NC of the different participating countries?
- Self-assessment of the previous/ongoing NCs is understandable. How this process would help the countries who are about to complete their SNC or who have already submitted proposal for TNC?
- There is need for broad guideline for self-assessment, so that the results of studies from 50 countries are comparable.
- This component aims at identifying project components eligible for GEF support. How can this help an ongoing project or a project about to be completed? Will GEF provide additional funds to an ongoing project? If some limitations or gaps are identified in an ongoing project, will GEF provide additional funds?
- The stock taking and self-assessment may assist preparation of proposals for the next NC.
- Self assessment should assess the impacts of previous or ongoing NC activities in promoting mitigation and adaptation projects. This component should also the sustainability of institutional arrangements and capacity built for preparation of NC. There is a specific need to assess the modelling capacity building requirements of the countries.
- One of the outputs is 50 NC project proposals submitted in 6 months. Will it be feasible to do this, since countries may be at different stages of preparing SNC or TNC? Will this project focus on countries who have not submitted proposals for SNC?

#### Component II:

- The objective of the second component is not clear.
- Will this funding be additional to project preparation grants, normally given to the countries by GEF?
- How will this project assist a country which has already submitted proposal for SNC or TNC?
- Is it some sort of bridge finance between ongoing NC and the next NC?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	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.