

# 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: November 08, 2017  
Screener: Sunday Leonard  
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios  
Consultant(s):

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

<b>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9788
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	5
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Kazakhstan
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	HCFC Phase-out in Kazakhstan through Promotion of Zero ODS Low GWP Energy Efficient Technologies
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	UNDP
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	Ministry of Energy (Department on climate change) of the Government of Kazakhstan
<b>GEF FOCAL AREA:</b>	Chemicals and Waste

### 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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. This project seeks to accelerate the phase-out of HCFCs in Kazakhstan with a view of putting the country on track to achieve its 2020 compliance objectives. The project is targeted at HCFCs use in the refrigeration and air conditioning, and polyurethane foams production in the country.
2. Kazakhstan is already significantly delayed in meeting its compliance obligations under the Montreal Protocol, exceeding its maximum allowable consumption of HCFCs and methyl bromide for 2011, 2012 and 2013. The country has however submitted a plan of action to ensure its return to compliance with an ultimate goal of achieving zero ODP-tonnes of HCFCs by 2020.
3. Barriers to meeting this commitment include institutional challenges, inadequate policies and regulations, deficiency of finance, and lack of technical capacity. This project is designed to help Kazakhstan overcome these barriers.
4. A detailed baseline on the various HCFCs-consuming sectors was presented in the project document including the volume of imports, the consuming sectors and the types of companies involved. This is commended by the STAP.
5. The baseline data suggest that meeting Kazakhstan's goal is possible, but would be challenging considering the amounts of refrigerators and cooling equipment in the country, the economic activities involved, the diverse places where this equipment are currently installed, and the short timeline for achieving the 2020 goal. Hence, STAP recommends that a detailed project management analysis should be carried out at the PPG stage and rigorous monitoring and evaluation component should be put in place to monitor and access progress during project implementation.

6. A good number of stakeholders has been identified, which is commendable. It is recommended that these stakeholders are engaged from the onset to ensure buy-in, especially given the critical role they will play in achieving the project objectives. A robust coordination framework should also be put in place to manage the stakeholder engagement and for coordinating with existing related projects at the national and regional levels.

7. It is envisaged that the project would result in a 99.5% reduction in the consumption of HCFCs by 2020. In Paragraph 4 of page 13 of the project document, this was estimated to be 39.3 ODP-tons reduction, that is the current baseline: 39.5 ODP-tons – year 2020 expected consumption: 0.2 ODP-tons = 39.3. However, the table in Section F, page 7 of the project document indicated that the expected global environment benefits would be 12.78 ODP-tons. It is not clear how this second estimate was calculated, and why there is a discrepancy between the two estimates. STAP request that this should be clarified when the project document is developed further.

9. HCFCs are a strong climate forcing agents with GWPs that are significantly higher than that of carbon dioxide (see, for example, UNEP 2011: <http://www.ccacoalition.org/en/resources/hfcs-critical-link-protecting-climate-and-ozone-layer-synthesis-report>; Montzka et al., 2011: <https://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v476/n7358/abs/nature10322.html>). Hence, this project is expected to deliver climate benefits, and this should be recognized in the expected global environmental benefits from this project.

10. As stated in the project document (page 12), component 2 of the project will demonstrate low-GWP energy efficient refrigerant technologies. This is expected to reduce energy demand in the country and consequently yield CO2 reduction and climate benefits (see, for example, Shah et al. 2015. <https://ies.lbl.gov/sites/all/files/lbnl-1003671.pdf>). This climate benefit should also be recognized under the expected global environment benefits from this project.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:  (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to 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.
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:  (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.  The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.  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.

