

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel



The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3794**

**COUNTRY (IES): NIGERIA**

**PROJECT TITLE: PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN RESIDENTIAL AND PUBLIC SECTOR IN NIGERIA**

**GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): NATIONAL ENERGY COMMISSION OF NIGERIA,**

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

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SP-1**

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N/A**

### 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

1. As the project interventions target both, residential and public sectors, STAP recommends differentiating barriers and measures to overcome them for each sector. Furthermore, STAP advises conducting a systematic assessment of barriers and rank them to prioritize project interventions.
2. PIF does not specify whether the project focuses on buildings (and within buildings, on lighting or lighting plus appliances) and/or industrial sectors. The energy systems targeted for EE improvement should be clearly identified based on projected GHG emissions or energy consumptions at the project preparation phase.
3. Project baseline for GHG emissions is absent. How will the first incremental costs of EE appliances be addressed, and what incentives provided?
4. How will the project help to build capacity for disposal of CFL, other Hg-containing lamps as well as CFC-containing refrigeration appliances?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	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.
2. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	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: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (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 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. <b>Major revision required</b>	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. 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.