

# 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: May 09, 2012

Screeener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT MULTI TRUST FUNDS**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4880

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Climate Technology Transfer Mechanisms and Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean

**GEF AGENCIES:** IADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)  
Instituto Nacional de Ecologia, Mexico (INE)  
National governments, research institutions, private sector, non-governmental organizations

**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 at developing technology transfer (TT) mechanisms and networks in LAC region. STAP welcomes this initiative, and at the same time suggests consideration of the following issues during the project preparation phase:

1. Criteria for identifying low-carbon technologies: There is a need for developing criteria for identifying low carbon technologies which are cost-effective and which provide large mitigation potential. The PIF mentions innovative low carbon technologies, but is silent however on what criteria would be adopted for selection of innovative low carbon technologies.
2. Focus on TT mechanisms and networks: STAP recommends focusing on developing and disseminating TT mechanisms and networks, rather than investing in installing low carbon technologies. Small-scale investments in some areas in the LAC region will not make any impact on a large-scale transfer of climate mitigation technologies.
3. Identification of countries and regions: LAC is a large region consisting of countries with diverse technical and institutional capacities for promoting climate change mitigation technologies. Thus there is a need to develop criteria to identify regions, sectors and technologies for TT. The PIF proposes developing thematic networks for mitigation technologies. Which themes will be selected and what criteria will be adopted for selecting the themes? Further, the PIF states showcasing best practices for south-south collaboration. What criteria would be adopted for selecting the best practices?
4. Strengthening technology networks and centers: The PIF presents outputs and activities for strengthening the technology networks and centers for mitigation as well as adaptation. The approaches and outputs seem to be identical for mitigation and adaptation technologies. Surely the outputs, the activities and approaches will vary amongst mitigation and adaptation interventions. Adaptation typically involves interventions related to addressing the needs for promoting social and community participation, enhancing capacity of impacted stakeholders, etc. Support for mitigation should include private sector participation, preparation of business plans, financing etc.
5. Building institutional capacity in the region: Development and transfer of climate mitigation technologies would require adequate technical and institutional capacity. All countries may not have adequate technical capacity to adopt

modern mitigation technologies. STAP suggests that the project give adequate importance to building technical and institutional capacity where necessary to enable countries in the LAC region to adapt and disseminate climate mitigation technologies.

6. Barrier analysis and lessons learnt: The LAC region must have experienced dissemination and transfer of a large number of climate change mitigation technologies, especially by IADB, World Bank etc. What are the barriers identified and lessons learnt by these programmes and projects in different countries within LAC that could help in promoting the transfer of climate mitigation technologies in this project?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. 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.
<b>2. 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: <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> 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.
<b>3. 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.