

# 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 07, 2013

Screener: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath

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:** 5365

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Vietnam

**PROJECT TITLE:** Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Construction

**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 aims at improved energy efficiency performance in commercial and high rise buildings. The project has very familiar objectives, components and activities typical of energy efficiency projects in the building sector that provides many opportunities for improving the energy efficiency according to International Energy Agency. To improve the proposal further, STAP recommends addressing the following recommendations during its development.

1. STAP recommends reference to a report from GEF- STAP "Climate Change: A scientific assessment for GEF" available at [www.stapgef.org](http://www.stapgef.org) The report provides details on the following: i) low cost and high mitigation potential; ii) high cost and high mitigation potential; and, iii) socially relevant energy access building technologies for developing countries. STAP recommends assessment of different combinations of technologies in the building sector, since there are a large number of technologies and interventions available for improving energy efficiency in buildings. Opportunities include: space heating, cooling, lighting, water heating, ventilation, cooking, appliances, and building construction materials and literally a large number of activities and technologies are involved.
2. The barriers mentioned are very generic and thus it is necessary to conduct an assessment to identify specific barriers to enable targeted interventions.
3. It is not clear why public buildings are being excluded, since it may be easier to implement the energy efficiency measures where the government controls and manages the building.
4. STAP suggests a clear separate set of strategies for new buildings and for retrofitting of existing buildings. Both provide large opportunities.
5. How will the technology packages be developed? Does the CEEB have the technical capacity to develop the technology packages?
6. The focus seems to be largely on developing institutional capacity and the guidelines for the sector. However, in reality to achieve market development a large number of activities, such as technology package development, demonstrating the financial viability of the energy efficiency technologies, and creating awareness, will be necessary.
7. Many other countries have revised their building codes to improve energy efficiency so it would be wise to initially conduct a full review to glean ideas and to learn from the experiences of others. Based on the proposal, this has

possibly been undertaken already, but if not, it should become part of the proposal. But how best to enforce the code is one useful lesson, and how to overcome a possible rebound effect is one example not covered in the proposal.

8. It could be a useful exercise as part of the project to bring together, on occasions, the various building energy managers from the demonstrations so they can compare notes and learn from each other. The challenge to encourage building owners to improve the building efficiency when it is their tenants who pay the energy bills, appears to be under due consideration in this proposal.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i>      | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. <b>Consent</b>                  | <p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>   |
| 2. <b>Minor revision required.</b> | <p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:<br/>           (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.<br/>           (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>   |
| 3. <b>Major revision required</b>  | <p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:<br/>           (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.<br/>           (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p> |