

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 07, 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: 4498

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Global (Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo, Djibouti, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Cambodia, St. Lucia, Liberia, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Palau, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Chad, Zambia)

PROJECT TITLE: Umbrella Programme for National Communication to the UNFCCC

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Government 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 this project for preparing National Communications to UNFCCC. It is commendable that the project aims at continuity in strengthening of national capacities and institutional mechanisms for preparation of National Communications, since having a gap between two successive projects is not desirable. Some of the following issues could be considered during project preparation:

1. What technical and institutional gaps or barriers were identified during the previous or ongoing National Communications to be addressed in the new National Communications? What lessons learned during the first NC are incorporated, since there is a need for improvement between successive NCs?
2. GHG inventory estimates for most countries are characterized by high uncertainties. 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? It is suggested to explore the feasibility of adopting the IPCC-GPG approach for LULUCF sector for reliable GHG estimates.
3. SIDs and LDCs are most vulnerable to climate change. Any attempt to assess vulnerability will require complex modeling in different sectors. There is a need to identify the modeling and data needs for each sector and initiate action to meet the challenge. Climate change impact assessments should be at finer grid scales.
4. Developing adaptation measures and practices will also be challenge, since they depend on reliable identification of climate projections and impacts.
5. 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.

<p>2. Minor revision required.</p>	<p>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:</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>