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I. PIF Information (Copied from the PIF)

FULL SIZE PROJECT   GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 4933  GEF PROJECT IDTURATION : 3
COUNTRIES: Indonesia
PROJECT TITLE: Third National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
GEF AGENCIES: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment
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

The project aims at preparation of a third national communications and biennial inventory reports to the UNFCCC. As with all enabling activities, STAP welcomes this work and provides consent to the project. The PIF is very well written and the project has many new innovative components aimed at delivering a good national communications report and biennial inventory reports.

A few suggestions could be considered during project preparation:

1. Coverage of regions and sectors for the inventory: PIF states that institutional arrangement for inventory will be established for agriculture and waste sector, further, for 2 administrative areas â€“ Jakarta and Riau provinces. STAP presumes the other sectors and regions are already covered under institutional arrangements for inventory purposes.

2. Adoption of IPCC GHG inventory guidelines-2006 and Tier-3 approach: STAP commends Indonesia for adopting the latest IPCC guidelines as well as to aim for Tier-3 to provide the most reliable inventory estimates.

3. Climate change scenarios for impact assessment: STAP suggests adoption of latest RCP (Representative Concentration Pathways) scenarios for climate projections and impact assessments. STAP also further suggests adoption of multiple climate change scenarios and multiple GCMs.

4. MRV for mitigation actions: STAP commends Indonesia for planning to establish institutional arrangements and build capacity for MRV of mitigation actions.

5. Impact assessment models: STAP suggests adoption of sectoral impact assessment models for Indonesia and wherever possible use multiple impact assessment models. Impact assessment should be carried out using climate projections from RCPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minor revision</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
required. | 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.