

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:	9436
PROJECT DURATION:	5.5
COUNTRIES:	Global (Chile, Indonesia, Myanmar, Tunisia, South Africa)
PROJECT TITLE:	Leapfrogging Markets to High Efficiency Products (Appliances, including Lighting, and Electrical Equipment) (PFD Resubmission of #9083)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP, DBSA and UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. The project aim is to increase the uptake of more efficient lighting and appliances in a number of countries by market transformation and building on an earlier UNEP SE4All project. Substantial private sector support is evident. This is a well formulated project proposal with few comments needed.
2. Gaining success and harmonization by targeting nine specific countries and a wide range of others should prove to be a beneficial approach. Training of trainers is a key component. National and non-national child projects are planned. However, it is not clear how the city level child projects (assuming that is what is meant here by "non-national") will be selected? Will there be only one per nation? Discussion on the non-national child projects does not appear in section 9 "€" so it is not exactly clear what is intended for this initiative. Or perhaps the term "non-national" here implies global as in "Global child project" as used on page 2. If so, then it is certainly confusing for the reader not to stick to using the same terminology throughout the proposal.
3. The MEPS approach has been well tested in many countries and is sound as is labeling "€" but educating the public as is proposed is key. Not only the public but more important are retail sales staff who frequently turn over so continual updating is required. Surveys elsewhere have shown it to be a weak link in the process when the retailers fail to understand the reason for the labels.
4. It is not easy to assess GHG emission reductions in a project like this as there are wide variations and uncertainties. Hence the wide range of 69-150 Mt CO₂ is understandable. Taking refrigerators, air-conditioners and transformers as examples is OK but of course, a very simplified approach. It is assumed different emission factors were used for electricity grids in each of the participating countries. But are all the appliances in the project assumed to be electrical? What about LPG stoves or water heaters for example? And domestic cook stoves? Are these all included? More robust calculations should be provided for child projects. The revised GHG manual and guidelines could be considered:
<https://www.thegef.org/gef/ghg-accounting>.

5. Due to the complexity, consideration should be given to the Programme Steering Committee meeting more regularly than the proposed once a year at least in the initial stages.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	<p>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.</p>
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. (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>