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: April 14, 2014 Screener: Virginia Gorsevski

Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims; Annette Cowie
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*
FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 5745
PROJECT DURATION : 5
COUNTRIES : Nigeria
PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Fuelwood Management in Nigeria
GEF AGENCIES: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Federal Ministry of Environment, Energy Commission of Nigeria, Federal Ministry of Health, Cross River State Government, Nigerian Alliance for Improved Cookstoves
GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this project which aims to improve the understanding by 10 model communities of how to procure and utilise fuelwood sustainably and avoid deforestation that is currently common practice in Nigeria. Alternative energy sources for cooking and heating are introduced as a means of reducing the reliance on unsustainable fuelwood demand. All of these alternative technologies (more efficient cook stoves, biogas, LPG, and solar heating systems) are well understood. They key issue is how to deploy them under Nigerian conditions supported by robust policies.

2. The baseline includes initiatives and projects already in place for avoiding deforestation, reducing fuelwood consumption demand, deployment of clean cooking solutions, their financing, and related to policies.

3. The problem is these topics are being discussed in isolation. Cook stoves are already manufactured in Nigeria and producing standards make sense. The recommendation is that experiences from many other countries in this regard are studied as they can assist the process. It is an innovative project for Nigeria perhaps, but not globally.

4. In addition, it is stated that less than 0.1% of households in CRS use improved cookstoves due to low awareness and market demand with a major problem being inertia, perceptions and reluctance to change. For this reason, it is extremely important that the needs and preferences of users are clearly understood from the outset. Studies over the past 20+ years have repeatedly indicated that cookstoves are most widely accepted if they are designed with the user's needs in mind and this varies greatly depending on the country/region/community, etc. (Bielecki, C. And G. Wingenback. 2014. Rethinking improved cookstove diffusion programs: A case study of social perceptions and cooking choices in rural Guatemala. Energy Policy 66: 350 â€“ 358. And Inayatullah, J. What makes people adopt improved cookstoves? Empirical evidence from rural northwest Pakistan." Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 16: 3200 â€“ 3205.

5. Therefore, prior to explaining the benefits of cookstoves through proposed awareness and training activities, it would be useful to hold targeted focus groups to ensure that the Ekwuk stove is appropriate because if it fails, it will make future efforts to promote cookstoves or other energy saving technologies all the more difficult and certainly will hamper proposed efforts to scale up.

6. The various components of the project seem realistic. It is assumed selection of the 3 possible sites for the community run forest management system pilot was done carefully but it is not clear what the basis was. How will the capacity building of the local communities be undertaken?

7. Assessing the energy demands will be challenging as these may evolve as new technologies are deployed. Who will conduct these assessments? The low cost cook stove design activity will need to take into account local materials and manufacturing skills. There has been much research already undertaken so this needs to be evaluated.

8. The assessment of mitigation potential is fairly scant, though it is realised there is complexity due to land use changes. More detailed analysis would be useful. How will it be monitored and evaluated without such analysis?

9. What is also not clear is how replication will be achieved of the pilot study and also how alternative systems (other than improved cookstoves) will be assessed. Is it just on cost or are convenience, health and other benefits also to be included?

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
1. Consent	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. 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.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3. Major revision required	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (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. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.