

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: September 21, 2015

Screeener: Virginia Gorsevski

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: 9220

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Tuvalu

PROJECT TITLE: Facilitation of the Achievement of Sustainable National Energy Targets of Tuvalu (FASNETT)

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Energy Department - Ministry of Works and Energy; Tuvalu Electricity Corporation

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

The aim of this project is to raise awareness by public, businesses, and the energy sector for renewables and energy efficiency in meeting the 100% renewable electricity target by 2020, mainly through solar PV and biodiesel use in diesel-fuelled generation sets.

Evaluation of existing projects and capacity building programmes are to be reviewed and information disseminated. Policies and capacity building initiatives are to be improved. Low-carbon technologies are to be reviewed and applied as demonstrations for island communities where appropriate.

A national energy plan is in place for this small country. It has received considerable financial support for a range of energy projects, but there remains a lack of understanding, particularly by those not living on the main island. In addition, despite the fact that there is a stated goal by the Government of Tuvalu to obtain 100% of its energy from renewables, it appears that the TNEP (Tuvalu National Energy Policy) does not "specifically provide a detailed action plan for implementing and enforcing the country's energy policy". This is a significant shortcoming particularly in light of the fact that there are numerous donor-funded projects ongoing by the World Bank, New Zealand Aid, etc. whose combined activities will presumably help Tuvalu move toward its ambitious goal.

The small project investment of \$109,500 is to build on this range of existing projects by improving the understanding by the energy sector of managing and maintaining projects and raise the public's knowledge level of the benefits, and hence gain wider acceptance.

The claimed 273.3 kt CO₂ reductions is hard to justify for this project, given all the other initiatives that support displacing diesel power generation by renewables (see Footnote 12). Around 40% of total cumulative emissions reduction by 2020 is attributed to the financing initiatives from this project and a lifetime avoidance of 109.3 kt CO₂. It is difficult to accept that by creating greater awareness, such a large increase in emission reductions will result, except by better informing residents on the outlying islands and this is certainly to be encouraged.

There is no comment made on the load-following challenges for the local grids when they have a growing share of solar generation that is a variable resource. It is assumed that the biodiesel generation is able to be dispatched at times of low solar radiation and high demand.

With respect to Knowledge Management, how will information from this project relate to existing knowledge centres for the region such as SPREP (Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program) and the newly created Pacific Climate Change Portal (<http://www.pacificclimatechange.net/>)? Or the Clean Energy Information Portal – REEGLE – (<http://www.reegle.info/index.php?>)

<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>