

# 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: 17<sup>th</sup> March 2009

Screeener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3880**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P115066**

**COUNTRY(IES): TOGO**

**PROJECT TITLE: TOGO EFFICIENT LIGHTING PROGRAM**

**GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank, (select), (select)**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): COMPAGNIE ENERGIE ELECTRIQUE DU TOGO (CEET)**

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Climate Change,(select), (select)**

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): CC-SP1-EE**

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: WEST AFRICA ENERGY PROGRAM**

### 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

STAP supports, with reservations identified below, the Togo efficient lighting program aimed at market transformation for compact fluorescence lamps (CFL) through introduction of energy efficiency standards, consumer awareness campaigns, and CFL bulk procurement. STAP requests that the following comments are addressed which are intended to assist the proponent to improve the design of the full project brief:

1. STAP acknowledges the "scientific soundness" of the project framework, but the potential impact of some interventions could be clarified. The project aims to address major market transformation barriers for efficient lighting. Experience in other countries shows that major market barriers include consumer awareness, price dynamics, CFL quality issues, consumer purchasing behaviour, and market entrance barriers. Proponents are advised to consider these and other market barriers in a systematic way when conducting market study and survey. The project puts major emphasis on capacity building for regulatory authorities and consumer education, while other upstream segments of the market (exporters and retailers) are not sufficiently targeted. Proponents are advised to consider and design interventions aimed at providing regulatory and financial incentives for these players, who are central to the supply side of the CFL market.
2. The sustainability of the proposed CFL bulk procurement approach needs clarification. Providing consumers with a one-time opportunity to purchase CFLs at a subsidized price may not have a long-lasting impact on CFL market transformation. Project proponents may look for more efficient upstream interventions, e.g. facilitating agreements between CEET and retailers that provide the latter with incentives to participate actively in the market transformation process. It is proposed that 400,000 bulbs will be replaced; clarification of the number of customers covered would be useful.
3. Project interventions do not address demand side of the market. How lighting energy consumption will be monitored (lighting audits) and risk for potential rebound effect avoided? What financial incentives consumers may have to make a switch to CFLs (subsidy, electricity tariff or etc.)?

4. Togo's capacity for Hg-containing CFL disposal has to be addressed in the final project document.
5. *Baseline GHG emissions:* In Togo 93% of electricity is imported from Ghana and Nigeria. What is the source of the electricity production in Ghana and Nigeria under the baseline scenario? If Ghana is producing electricity from hydro, then there will be no net GHG emission/reductions.
6. *Product efficiency standards and labelling:* If all the CFLs are going to be imported, regulation of the imports is necessary.
7. Sustainability of market transformation beyond the project period, when the subsidy may not be available for CFLs procurement, needs clarification. How will the incremental first cost of CFLs be met in the long term?

<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: <ol 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> </ol> 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.