

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 04<sup>th</sup> February 2010

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: **4133**

COUNTRY(IES): **BURUNDI**

PROJECT TITLE: **BURUNDI ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROJECT**

GEF AGENCY(IES): **World Bank**

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): **REGIDESO**

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): **Climate Change**

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): **CC-SP1**

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: **WEST AFRICA ENERGY PROGRAM**

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP provides consent to the project aimed at promoting energy efficiency in Burundi. This project has multiple components namely; distribution of CFLs, public awareness creation, technical and managerial capacity building for EE in large commercial and industrial consumers, developing building codes and pilot provision of EE for rural and displaced poor. The project rightly identifies lighting as the key electricity using activity and even has a social goal of providing EE lighting systems for the poorest and displaced families - an appreciable goal indeed. The project seems to have a very broad scope, with a mix of different components and stakeholders: from provision of lighting to displaced families to large industrial users to building codes. Given that lighting is the main electricity-consuming factor, the focus could have been on EE lighting in residential and commercial sectors.
2. **Focused and targeted approach:** Need to identify and rank the activities based on electricity consumption and efficiency of current use. Based on the demand and opportunity for energy conservation, identify the activities for intervention. Currently support is requested for residential, commercial, industrial, buildings sectors and lighting for the poorest and displaced persons.
3. **Baseline scenario:** There is a need to develop a baseline scenario covering detailed consideration of current and projected sources of and extent of energy use and efficiency in different sectors, and the associated GHG emissions.
4. **LEDs for the poorest:** This could represent a technological leap-frogging by proving the most efficient lighting system. This experiment needs to be watched carefully. The costs and benefits of LEDs to the poor should be considered before implementation.
5. **Economic sustainability of EE lighting:** It is assumed that CFLs and LEDs will be supplied free, on the assumption that energy and cost saved will persuade families to shift to EE lighting. Rationale of giving 3 CFLs free of cost need to be carefully studied. Should the CFLs be free for all or only for the poor? STAP has concerns that free distribution practice is sustainable in the long-term. What other incentives are needed for promoting a shift to CFLs in the long-term?
6. **Poor electric grids and large technical losses of electricity:** These issues are mentioned but no strategy to address them was proposed.

7. **Barriers for energy efficiency:** There are multiple components facing potentially different barriers. There is a need for a barrier analysis to identify, rank and prioritize barriers for intervention. The key barrier of high prices or first cost needs to be addressed and the emphasis on awareness and capacity building activities may not be sufficient.
8. **Importing of bulbs, air conditioners, etc:** If they are imported, what measures are proposed to control, regulate and enforce imports of EE systems?

| <i>STAP advisory response</i>      | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>1. Consent</b>                  | 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.   |
| <b>2. Minor revision required.</b> | 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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 revision required</b>  | 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.<br>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.   |