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: 25th January 2010 Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information

GEF PROJECT ID: **4009**
COUNTRY(IES): **ROMANIA**
PROJECT TITLE: **FINANCING PUBLIC BUILDING EFFICIENCY IN ROMANIA**
GEF AGENCY(IES): **EBRD**
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):
GEF FOCAL AREA (S): **CLIMATE CHANGE**
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): **CC-SP1**
NAME OF PARENT/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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. The proposed EBRD project aims to reduce financial barriers for support of energy efficient measures in public buildings in Romania. GEF funds are requested for supporting capacity building for EE financing, pre-feasibility studies and the establishment of a dedicated financial mechanism for ESCOs using different financial instruments. Romania has strong and aggressive regulations, policies and programs to promote EE. Further, other similar projects have been implemented including the GEF/UNDP project on "Capacity building for GHG emissions reduction" as well as the World Bank GEF project "Romania EE project". These two projects had similar objectives. There are other on-going efforts in Romania to promote EE in buildings. There is, therefore, a need for clearly defining the comparative advantage of this project so that it does not overlap with the other projects.

2. STAP recommends minor revision to address the above concerns and also the following more specific issues. This project would benefit from learning from the past and ongoing activities by introducing clearly defined technical assistance activities addressing key barriers rather than listing generic activities such as Project Identification, Energy Audits, Improved Tendering, and Capacity Building.

3. The rational for focusing on EE in public buildings needs to be provided. It could be based on large mitigation potential, cost effectiveness and availability of EE technologies.

4. The baseline definition and barrier analysis are absent. PIF does not provide sufficient information and justification why financing for ESCOs is the only major barrier to be addressed by the project?

5. It is not clear what energy efficient technologies/measures will be supported by the project (heating, air conditioning, lighting, retrofit, thermal envelope and etc)? How will investments be prioritized? Old or new public buildings or both will be supported? A detailed analysis of technologies/measures to be promoted including their GHG mitigation potential, cost-effectiveness, investment returns and etc. is required at the CEO endorsement phase.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
1. Consent	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. Minor revision required.	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. Major revision required	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.