

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: June 03, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims

Consultant(s): Margarita Dyubanova

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5390

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Antigua And Barbuda

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Pathways - Protected Areas and Renewable Energy

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Environment Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing and the Environment

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 innovative and well researched proposal that has a goal to enhance financing and management of protected areas through innovations in renewable energy capacity and arrangements on a relatively small scale. The project builds on a baseline of projects and the experience gained and lessons learned from previous and ongoing projects in the region. The goals are clearly stated and the strategies for achieving these goals are sound from the scientific and technical perspectives; expected outcomes and outputs are clearly defined. Generated by the project global environmental benefits of biodiversity protection, sustainable forest management, and climate change mitigation are scientifically sound.

2. The wind speeds have been monitored and look OK, as are the levels of solar radiation. The data from RETScreen and GIZ are sound. The project promises to provide interesting results that could be used in other similar situations elsewhere in the world. Gaining further experience from real world projects and assessing the actual outputs against modeled outputs will be a useful process.

3. Many risks are stated for which mitigation measures have been identified. The proposal identifies points 1 through 7 that are to be addressed during the PPG phase (page 3). In case of partial success, each of the points puts the project's success at risk. Therefore, STAP recommends identifying mitigation measures for these points.

4. Conducting a more detailed feasibility study is essential as there remain many uncertain costs and risks involved in the concept plan, especially at the scale being mooted. The demonstration project will then be useful to confirm all the assumptions made in the analysis. The number and capacity of wind turbines to be selected could impact on the scale and cost of this demo project (e.g. is it a single 1 MW turbine or five 200 kW turbines in the demo?). It is not clear how the success of the RE system (feasibility and demonstration) will be measured.

5. It is not clear who will develop the transmission lines to the hydro sites and the costs involved, especially if they are remote, but it states the best sites have relatively low inter-connection costs and therefore appears to have been considered.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
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.

	<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>
<p>2. Minor revision required.</p>	<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:</p> <p>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<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:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>