

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: November 06, 2017
Screener: Sunday Leonard
Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9905
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Kiribati
PROJECT TITLE:	Promoting Outer Island Development through the Integrated Energy Roadmap (POIDIER)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Public Works & Utilities (MPWU)
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 objective of this GEF project is to enhance the uptake of both renewable energy (RE) and energy efficiency (EE) by overcoming various policy, financial, awareness and technical barriers to contribute more to the sustainable development of these islands. This is expected to contribute to the achievement of the Island's RE and EE targets.
2. The project comes under the integrated roadmap linked to Kiribati's NDC. Policy development will be very important for success, including financial support mechanisms.
3. The country has 33 atolls widely dispersed, so the cost of delivering diesel for power generation and other fossil fuels is high. Reducing the demand for imported fossil fuels by substituting renewable energy (RE) is a key objective under the National Energy Policy as is energy efficiency (EE) improvements.
4. Many houses, schools, hospital, businesses on the outer islands already have solar PV systems, and biodiesel is being produced from coconut oil for transport and other uses.
5. Following a technology assessment, demonstration projects are planned for both on-grid and off-grid communities which will involve around 70% of the total GEF project investment and over 90% of the co-financing of around US\$27M, mostly through grants from the Ministry of Public Works and Utilities, and Ministry of Line and Phoenix Islands Development.
6. The baseline is shown as a range of existing projects. It is intended that these will be "improved," "enhanced," "repaired," "redesigned" "have added features" then be subsumed as demonstrations into this GEF project. The ages of these existing projects are not provided; nor are any details of exactly what changes are planned or who exactly will undertake these changes. On what basis has it been judged that

these existing projects are less efficient than they might be after upgrading? Who did the analysis, which would require considerable expertise and knowledge of the latest advances in these technologies?

7. Furthermore, would the original funding agencies for each of these projects be informed of the plans to update them and then subsume them into the GEF project, or has this been done already? Were these agencies at fault when building the projects initially so that they are now failing or need upgrading? What are the reasons why repairs are needed? Is it a lack of capacity of the local people to be unable to maintain them properly? How will it be possible to measure and monitor any improved benefits as a result of these suggested amendments? This is only possible if the existing projects have been closely monitored before any changes are made. Is such data available?

8. The role of the island community and the private sector is planned to be enhanced in the RE and EE sectors. However, the project document is not specific on how this role will be enhanced or what will be done specifically to encourage private sector involvement. Capacity building for local people must be a key part of the project. Training sessions are outlined under the "Knowledge Management" section, but capacity building should be a major part of the project and involve suitable funding and the use of trainers with the required level of expertise.

9. As shown in the baseline information and highlighted on page 7, several projects have been undertaken in the country that had information dissemination and awareness raising components. It is, however, claimed that there is limited awareness of RE and EE in the country. This project intends to devote funds to another round of awareness effort, but no information has been provided for the lack of success of previous effort and what this project will do differently to ensure success.

10. Over 1.1 kt CO₂ direct and indirect emissions are projected to be avoided as a result of this GEF project (which is around US\$ 24/t CO₂ avoided) (Section F, page 4). However, on page 15, the emission reduction potential from the KIER is stated to be around 480 kt by 2025. How is this reconciled? Does this imply the GEF investment will only give a slight reduction in emissions (<0.3%) over business as usual? This needs to be clarified.

11. Furthermore, do the climate benefits provided include x avoided black carbon emissions as a result of the replacement of diesel generators with RE technologies and from EE gains? This needs to be accounted for.

The above is of concern to be the STAP and need to be addressed by the project proponent as early as possible with follow-up actions.

<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	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	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:

project design	<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>
-----------------------	---