

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: October 08, 2011

Screener: Thomas Hammond

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4683

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Russian Federation

PROJECT TITLE: ARCTIC Targeted Support for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy in the Russian Arctic

GEF AGENCIES: EBRD

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation

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 project from the Russian Federation aims at reducing GHG emissions through support and financing for targeted investments in EE and RE in municipal infrastructure of the Russian Arctic. STAP suggests consideration of some of the following issues during project preparation:

1. Rationale for selecting cities/towns and infrastructure sectors/projects: There is a need for adopting criteria for identification of cities and towns as well as selecting sectors and technologies. The criteria could be based on the current or projected emissions, mitigation potential and cost effectiveness of mitigation. The focus of all the interventions seems to be promotion of investments in infrastructure projects. It is not clear which infrastructure sectors and projects would be targeted for promoting EE and RE technologies. Which RE and EE technologies will be included for mitigating climate change? There is a brief mention of a few sustainable energy projects.
2. Assessment of potential for EE and RE in the Russian Arctic: It is suggested to conduct a study to estimate the mitigation potential for the Arctic region according to different sectors and technologies. Further, EE and RE technological options available along with the cost and mitigation potential could be explored.
3. Baseline scenario: It is essential to develop a good current and projected energy mix for different sectors and the associated GHG emissions. The current rate of spread of RE and EE technologies under the existing and ongoing programmes and projects could be estimated and projected. Quantitative estimates are essential and should be developed.
4. Incremental investments and operational and maintenance cost risks: The implications of incremental costs for EE and RE technologies on the cost of energy to the end-users need to be considered.
5. Climate change risks: The PIF mentions the potential risks of climate change for the energy infrastructure on the one hand and the implications of warming on the demand for energy for heating applications. There is a need for a scientific assessment of the projected climate change, implications for energy infrastructure and energy demand.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 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. | <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <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> |
| 3. Major revision required | <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> |