

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: May 10, 2010

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: 4228

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Belarus

PROJECT TITLE: LGGE Improving Energy Efficiency in Residential Buildings in the Republic of Belarus

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Department on Energy Efficiency under the State Committee on Standardization of Belarus, Ministry of Architecture and Construction, Ministry of Environment

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: CC-1;

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

Project aims at removing legislative, institutional and technological barriers to improve energy efficiency of new residential buildings in Belarus. STAP expresses its consent, but notes several issues that have to be resolved before the CEO endorsement:

1. Sector and technology/systems selection: Project emphasis is on EE improvements in new residential buildings. The omission of commercial sector buildings is unclear. EE interventions in the commercial buildings sector are different compared to the residential sector. PIF does not provide information on where the project focus is "on construction materials (cement, steel, aluminum, glass, etc) or on technology systems for heating, lighting, etc.? STAP recommends project proponents to consider commercial sector buildings in project interventions and design them according to their GHG mitigation potential as well as provide justification for focusing on construction materials or EE systems or both.
2. Demonstration: Demonstration is proposed only for 2 new buildings, which seems to be inadequate to generate adequate outcomes to convince all stakeholders and generate information required for decision making. STAP recommends strengthening replication potential of this project. Which new technologies will be incorporated for demo buildings? (Component 3). It is suggested to make an assessment of performance of technologies with respect to cost and energy conservation, based on data from other countries.
3. Financial barriers: Incremental investment costs in new EE construction are significant and proper financial and fiscal incentives are usually required. Project does not address this important barriers and STAP recommends exploring the ways of strengthening enabling environment for financial support of EE interventions in new buildings sector.
4. Baseline: STAP recommends developing baseline estimates of current and projected energy consumption, to enable comparison of energy savings during project preparation.

| <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. |
| 2. Minor revision required. | <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> |
| 3. Major revision required | <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> |