

# 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: March 01, 2013

Screeener: 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:** 5098

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Montenegro

**PROJECT TITLE:** Towards Carbon Neutral Tourism

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, National Tourism Organization, UN World Tourism Organization, Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications, Ministry of Finance

**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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

The project aims to reduce the carbon footprint of tourism activities in Montenegro. Section D describes resources that cut across Climate change, Biodiversity and Land Degradation focal areas (though the latter two do not appear to be paramount in the proposal).

STAP observes that the private sector is to contribute over 80% of the total \$70.7M funding which is perhaps ambitious, though several greenfield tourism projects are already in progress (probably not to the level of investment as shown in Table 3 - eg EUR65 billion for the Velika Plaza - even if meant to be EUR 6.5 billion it still seems high). However, the cost of aiming towards a carbon neutral tourism industry is therefore a relatively small component of the total investment.

STAP has the following recommendations to improve project design:

1. GEF co-funding (50:50 with municipalities) is for energy efficient lighting, building retrofits, solar PV installations on public tourism buildings (and likely new walking/cycling infrastructure), but there is no breakdown to show what shares of total CO2 emission reductions will come from each separate project. Also how to undertake MRV on each of these activities is not clearly identified but have to be.
2. What are the criteria for selecting a pilot project of a new greenfield tourism development project? High private sector investment is anticipated, and this, quite correctly, is considered to be a medium risk. Criteria for selecting a pilot project have to be provided and justified.
3. Overall mitigation costs at \$70/t CO2-eq avoided (for 1.26 Mt CO2-eq) are relatively high, but other co-benefits will also materialize and could be qualitatively or quantitatively assessed.
4. Encouraging tourists to walk and cycle is commendable, but should there be a wet-weather option too, such as a bus system? Project proponents are recommended to consider low carbon public transportation options.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.

	<p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
<p><b>2. Minor revision required.</b></p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <p>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<p><b>3. Major revision required</b></p>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <p>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>