

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 07, 2016
Screener: Thomas Hammond
Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9151
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Bosnia-Herzegovina
PROJECT TITLE:	Catalyzing Environmental Finance for Low-Carbon Urban Development
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Environmental Protection Funds of Federation of BiH and Republic Srpska

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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. The project aims to support and encourage innovative finance for low-carbon urban development projects including waste, transport, energy efficiency and renewable energy. Aiming at municipal public buildings is a good approach. It is assumed this will be mainly retrofitting of existing buildings but are any new building designs planned? If so then, to gain international credibility, they should be linked with gaining a LEED building rating <http://www.usgbc.org/LEED/> or to the Living Building Challenge <http://living-future.org/lbc/certification>.
2. Retrofitting of historic buildings to become more energy efficient is a great challenge but good examples exist – see for example <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378778814009190> and http://transact.westminster.gov.uk/docstores/publications_store/Retrofitting_Historic_Buildings_for_Sustainability_January_2013.pdf
3. Similarly there are many examples of improving city transport systems to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in spite of growing travel demands. These are well addressed in the proposal. The challenge is to mobilise the necessary finance.
This project addresses this and includes staff training and MRV to track investments. Introducing the EMIS makes good sense. Linking transport logistics and waste management through landfills into one component is interesting, but attempts to minimize the waste volumes and encourage recycling at source, with separate collections of glass, plastics etc., appears to be a gap. It is not clear how waste collection is carried out in the suburbs. For example see San Borja in Peru
http://transact.westminster.gov.uk/docstores/publications_store/Retrofitting_Historic_Buildings_for_Sustainability_January_2013.pdf page 54.
4. Section 1.4 fails to explain how the mitigation potentials were calculated or what assumptions were made. Reducing the organic wastes entering the landfills to reduce methane is not considered, nor the

benefits from having 5 or 6 central well-managed landfills as opposed to the hundreds of small informal ones as at present.

5. Was consideration given to collecting the landfill gas for energy uses? It is mentioned in the strategy on page 10 but not considered elsewhere. If implemented, this would result in relatively large GHG emission reductions given the high global warming potential of methane from leakages. These could well greatly exceed any CO₂ mitigation from the transport logistics being considered in the project and should be explored during project preparation.

6. Interestingly, solid waste management does not appear in BiH's INDC though solid waste disposal on land and wastewater handling do.

7. The project proponents should liaise with the other urban development projects that are progressing under the GEF Cities IAP and use similar methodologies and indicators as they evolve:

<https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/10826>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(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.</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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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>