

# 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: 27-3-2008

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3538

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:**

**COUNTRY(IES):** India

**PROJECT TITLE:** Programmatic Framework Project for EE in India

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** World Bank, UNDP, UNIDO

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

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

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** EE in existing Buildings SP-1; EE in SMEs SP-2; EE in Indian Railways SP-2

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK FOR EE IN INDIA

**Full size project      GEF Trust Fund**

### 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

2. The Programmatic Framework Project on Energy Efficiency has vast potential to conserve energy, reduce GHG emissions and bring cost savings.

i) **Scientific and Technical Component:** Building, SME and railway sectors offer hundreds of opportunities for technological intervention for energy conservation and GHG emission reduction. It may be desirable to have a scientific criteria or methodology for selecting and prioritizing technologies for intervention at the time of implementation. The factors could include;

- a. Potential for energy conservation or GHG emissions reduction
- b. Barriers; feasibility to remove and impact
- c. Cost-effectiveness of technologies
- d. Energy cost as proportion of total cost (as mentioned for SME)

Further, identification of technologies/interventions for investment could also be based on a scientific criterion.

ii) **Baseline Situation:** Baseline scenario situation could be better defined to reflect the energy consumption, GHG emission, and spread of technologies and implications of barriers. A scientific method may have to be applied for estimation and monitoring of baseline at the time of implementation.

iii) **Risks and Mitigation measures:** Risks and mitigation measures could be expanded to cover several risks such as technical performance, higher investment costs, and benefits versus costs.

iv) **Methods and Monitoring:** The project implementation could be strengthened by considering various methods for monitoring energy use and GHG emissions in control situation and project impacted situation.

v) **Barrier Analysis:** Since India has Energy Conservation Building Code (2007) and other standards and regulations, it may be a good idea to conduct barrier analysis using AHP (Analytical Hierarchy Process), at implementation phase, to identify and rank barriers.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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"> <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> <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>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>