REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	**11430**
Project title	Integrated Program for HFC Phasing Down and Sustainable Cooling for Tajikistan
Date of screen	**22 January 2024**
STAP Panel Member	**Miriam Diamond**
STAP Secretariat	**Sunday Leonard**

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This project is motivated by the need for Tajikistan to comply with the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol to reduce HFC production and use by 70% by 2029. Current projections indicate that HFC use could increase exponentially and eventually comprise 7% of total GHG emissions in the country. In particular, this project is targeting the country's inefficient cooling systems. It is unclear how much the foam sector will be involved.

A strength of the proposal is Tajikistan's past accomplishment of eliminating the use of CFC five years ahead of other A5 countries as part of the Montreal Protocol. The proposal clearly identifies opportunities for innovation and achieving the durability of proposed activities. The Theory of Change (ToC) is comprehensive and contains logical pathways. Consultations have been held with key stakeholders such as financing agencies and the refrigerant and cooling industrial sector. Women's inclusion has been laid out through logical activities.

STAP has made a few recommendations to strengthen the proposal as laid out in Sections 2 and 3 of this review screen.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

- □ **Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit**
- □ Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design
- □ Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

1. **Systems thinking.** The proposal outlines the current situation, the future vision, and logical and feasible pathways for achieving that vision. Methods of implementation are considered for each component in the context of barriers. One point requiring clarification is the inclusion/exclusion of the foam sector, which, according to baseline information, is responsible for ~12% of HFC consumption.

2. **Uncertain futures:** Whilst the proposal discussed scenarios for the country to achieve compliance on HFC phase down, noting the role of economic performance and growing population, it did not address how these and other drivers can influence HFC use in the country and the plausible futures. This analysis could be useful when considering the assumptions (that require explanation) and risks. We encourage the project proponent to consider undertaking this analysis. Consult STAP's brief on Future Narratives for a guide on how to do this.

3. **Baseline, barriers, and enablers.** The baseline situation of HFC consumption, as well as sectoral uses of HFCs, are well described along with the target to discontinue HFC consumption where consumption is greatest – the refrigeration and air conditioning (RAC) industry. The main barriers are described, e.g., lack of awareness, training, coordination among stakeholders, economic incentives, and tools for monitoring. Enabling elements could be better described. One barrier/assumption not discussed is the possibility of illegal trade of HFCs as formal HFC use is wound down.

4. The **Theory of Change** (ToC) is centered on pathways to enable capacity building, knowledge management, and innovations in technologies, finance, and business. The ToC contains plausible mechanistic pathways connecting activities to outputs to outcomes and, ultimately, the goal. The key assumptions are also included.

- Assumptions are listed in the ToC but need to be discussed in terms of uncertain futures.

5. The **project components.** The project consists of 4 components under which many activities are listed. Below are some points that should be considered:

- Component 1 is improving the legislative and policy framework for phasing down HFC consumptions along with building financial instruments. The project intends to build a roadmap for sectors to take up alternative technologies. Are provisions considered should uptake not follow the roadmap?
- Component 2 is focused on capacity building and best practices in the RAC sector (but not foam?) through, for example, introducing a mandatory technician certification system (how will this be enforced?), strengthening infrastructure for refrigerant storage and transportation, demonstration projects on retrofitting of existing refrigeration systems. It is unclear if introducing incentive schemes is included under Component 1 (where financing is considered) or 2. Further details are needed to understand the implications and feasibility of expanding the refrigerant storage and transportation system. How will HFCs be destroyed?
- Component 3 is demonstrating low- GWP energy efficient alternative technologies and improving energy efficiency in the cooling sector. This component includes activities from conducting market research to identify local manufacturers and assemblers in the refrigerant and foam sectors. This component includes supporting the uptake of a Minimum Energy Performance Standard (MEPS), which is currently lacking. The component also includes mobilizing finance through, for example, blended financing, rightly focusing on replacing old and inefficient cooling systems.
- Component 4 involves KM, monitoring, evaluating, and promoting gender inclusivity. The latter will be achieved by recruiting women for technical and vocational training sessions. More details should be provided on what will be monitored, how monitoring will be conducted, what the metrics will be, and how information from monitoring will feed back to adapt planned activities.

6. The roles of **stakeholders** are well explained, including consultations with financial institutions and the RAC Association, which is critical to implementation.

7. **GEBs** described are, first, a reduction in HFC consumption and associated avoided GHG emissions. The calculation of avoided GHG emissions due to energy saving needs more explanation. The inclusion of the co-benefit of job creation is positive.

8. Steps taken towards achieving **policy coherence** require more explanation. The proposal does aim to strengthen the inter-agency coordination mechanism. Is lack of policy coherence a barrier?

9. **Risks** are described along with mitigative measures such as gender inclusion, involvement of government officials to maintain interest in the project, and the project team working with multiple partners to promote cooperation.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

STAP recommends that the project proponents address all of the comments in section 2 above, including the following:

- Clarify how and to what extent the foam sector will be included in activities.

- Develop a narrative of plausible futures given uncertainties and assumptions that could not come to fruition, such as changes in political support and a lack of stakeholder engagement and leadership. See STAP's primer on future narratives for more guidance.
- Clarify the assumptions used in calculating the expected GEBs related to energy efficiency.
- Give greater consideration to how the project will achieve policy coherence.
- Consider the barrier of illegal trade in HFCs and how the project might deal with this.
- More details regarding the monitoring program are needed, including metrics and how this information will inform adaptations to planned activities.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. , population growth, economic development, climate change, socio-cultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?

2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives)**, based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?

3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?

4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?

5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".

    - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
    - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
    - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
    - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?

6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?

7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?

8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

   - how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
   - how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
   - how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. **Innovation and transformation:**
    - If the project is intended to be **innovative:** to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
    - If the project is intended to be **transformative:** how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)