

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 07, 2016
Screener: Thomas Hammond
Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9191
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Tajikistan
PROJECT TITLE:	Green Energy SMEs Development
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Energy and Water Resources
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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. The project revolves around manufacturers of solar thermal systems and energy efficient stoves. It supports close involvement by women and financing. Distributed renewable electricity is another component to partly overcome the generation capacity deficit in meeting growing demand.

The government is supporting a new 150 MW coal-fired power plant goes against the need to move away from fossil fuel combustion "but gaining the balance between sustainable development, energy access, energy security and reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a challenge. That is why the uptake of more low-carbon technologies as in this project proposal should be encouraged.

However, it should be noted that building new coal-fired power plants goes against the target quoted in the INDC <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Tajikistan/1/INDC-TJK%20final%20ENG.pdf>

2. The support for SMEs working in with manufacturing and installing and maintaining low-carbon technologies is warranted providing finance helps to reduce the risks for these businesses. The other risks listed would be partly overcome through this project. The use of GEF funding to offer financial incentives to RESCO clients for small hydro and solar PV makes sense.

3. It is not clear where the figure of 300g CO₂/kWh came from if based on UNDP field surveys but this is too low for small diesel generation. It is more likely to be threefold that the average (http://www.world-nuclear.org/uploadedFiles/org/WNA/Publications/Working_Group_Reports/comparison_of_lifecycle.pdf). See also the UNFCCC "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" CDM Executive Board document that report 1300g CO₂/kWh from small-scale diesel generation plants: http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAMethodologies/tools/am-tool-05-v1.pdf/history_view

Also where the 130 g CO₂-eq //day for solar water heating came from is unclear since the GEF Lebanon project is not referenced.

These values need to be confirmed and mitigation potentials recalculated at the CEO endorsement stage.

4. Why the community of Pamiri Tajiks has been selected is not justified. Could there not be more than one community with differing solar radiation levels and hydro reliability? Is the hydro source reliable all year

round? What is the annual solar radiation level in this region “ and was that figure used for calculating the potentials? Selection criteria should be elaborated during project preparation.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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>