

# 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 08, 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:** 4956

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Europe and Central Asia)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Regional Climate Technology Transfer Center

**GEF AGENCIES:** EBRD

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**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 revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

The objective of the project is to accelerate investments in climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies in EBRD's countries. The title suggests that the focus is on promoting TT mechanisms, institutions and policies. However, the bulk of the GEF funding appears to be going towards investment and pilot projects. The project seems to provide financing for specific mitigation and adaptation investments. A few pilot projects in some localities may not have any sustainable impact on TT at the regional level. There are already many such individual successful pilot projects in the region. STAP recommends the project to focus on TT by developing mechanisms and institutions to promote TT based on current experience and lessons learned.

The PIF states that a pipeline of projects for TT will be identified and pilot projects will be supported for implementation. How will these projects be developed? What will be selection criteria? Such criteria should at least be proposed at this stage. A large number of technologies are listed in the Annex. There is need to prioritize and select appropriate technologies for promoting TT.

Adaptation: This component is simply an add-on. No significant allocation of funds or activities and outputs are proposed - and as such STAP believes adaptation is given cursory consideration. Budget allocated is too meager for even conducting a serious assessment study. The project therefore should simply focus on mitigation technologies only.

Barriers: Very generic text book-styled barriers are listed. The EBRD covered region may consist of a large diversity of countries. Thus sub-regional or country specific-barrier assessment is recommended.

TT Centre: Details of the proposed TT centre are needed and what criteria will be adopted for the this centre. Which sectors, technologies and countries will be the focus of this center?

<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:

	<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>
<p><b>3. Major revision required</b></p>	<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>