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: September 26, 2015 Screener: Lev Neretin

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: 9083
PROJECT DURATION : 5.5
COUNTRIES : Global (Costa Rica, Kazakhstan, Sudan)
PROJECT TITLE: Leapfrogging Markets to High Efficiency Products (Appliances, including Lighting, and Electrical Equipment)(PROGRAM)
GEF AGENCIES: UNEP and UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment (MINEA), Costa Rica
Ministry of Investment and Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan
Ministry of Water Resources, Irrigation and Electricity â€“ The Electricity Regulatory Authority (Sudan)
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. This is an ambitious program aiming to include many countries over the longer term and with a wide range of co-financiers. The child projects have not been sighted so this review relates only to the PFD. Overall, the PFD lacks important information about prioritization of different proposed activities, particularly a country-specific menu of options that limits the scope of STAP's advice. Such an ambitious expansion of coverage from 30 to 100 countries in the program is questionable and has to be scrutinized during program preparation.

2. The program appears to be well thought through and links well with other GEF funded country projects on energy efficient appliances at various stages of completion. It is encouraging that lessons learned from the more advanced of these projects will be assessed as such knowledge management approaches are not always undertaken.

3. The flexibility of the program that enables a country to make choices over the products to be included based on varying national situations makes good sense. It is also commendable that disposal of hazardous wastes at the end of life of an appliance is acknowledged in the approach. Ideally the cost of managing hazardous wastes including refrigerants will be built into the purchase price of the product (e.g., through an extended producer responsibility) so that sufficient funding is then available to ensure environmental and human health safeguards are put in place. However, the effectiveness of this approach will depend strongly on the regulatory and policy frameworks available and may be limited in many developing countries that project intends to cover.

4. The definition of "high efficiency products" is not fully clarified in the PDF but it is assumed it does not include appliances such as cook stoves, kerosene lamps and solar water heaters. Water heating is mentioned specifically in section 9 but it is not clear if heaters were included under this heading, or only electric resistance element systems?

5. The mitigation of 558 Mt CO2-eq is impressive but details of how this number was calculated are not provided. Since every country has a different emission factor for its power supply (kg CO2/kWh generated) and a wide range of energy consuming products are involved, the calculation is complex so can only be taken as very indicative. In addition, the rebound effect resulting from many energy saving initiatives is not

mentioned, so probably not included in the assessment. Project proponents are advised to follow the updated guidelines on GHG accounting released by the GEF recently (www.thegef.org/gef/node/11187).

6. MEPS work well, but will they be applied to imported products or only to those manufactured locally? To be effective they have to be applied to both groups, so any policies should be developed accordingly.

7. Fifteen countries (other than those with child projects) will receive funding support for training and capacity building. They will be selected by representatives of the SE4ALL Global Project but the criteria are not known. Perhaps this could be linked to the level of ambition of the INDCs of candidate countries?

8. While STAP acknowledges the merit and importance of various activities on knowledge management mentioned in the project, further details about prioritization of different activities to have an impact such as training of trainers, awareness raising and etc. have to be thought through. In structuring knowledge management support, STAP recommends considering emerging GEF-wide lessons learned (https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/11232).

9. STAP recommends considering further risks of the program. Some of mitigation measures listed in Section 5 (e.g., risks of policies not being implemented) have to be revised and focused on national and sub-national level actions more than on the role of intergovernmental organizations to generate national benefits.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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	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.
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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.