

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: May 08, 2012

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4959

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)

PROJECT TITLE: IDB-PPP MIF Public-Private Partnership Program

GEF AGENCIES: IADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

The goal of the MIF-IDB public-private partnership platform project is to facilitate private investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency and in sustainable use of natural resources, reducing GHG emissions. The PIF incorporates numerous generic statements regarding the logic and justification of promoting energy efficiency, however there is insufficient detail with which to undertake a thorough assessment. The following set of issues should be addressed during the project preparation phase:

RE and EE and Use of Natural Resources: Given the vast experience of IADB in financing energy projects in the region " the PIF could reasonably have identified which type of energy projects, of what scale, and in which countries GEF will support. Which 10 " 15 RE technologies would be selected and what is their rationale/criteria for selection? Similarly, which 10-15 SMEs will be selected and again what is the proposed rationale for selection? A systematic assessment of technologies, mitigation potential, IRR, barriers etc is recommended before CEO endorsement.

Biodiversity and Energy: On this issue, it would appear that there is a relatively awkward mix of BD concerns in what is largely an energy project (note - this project was not screened by the STAP-BD Panel Member). There is little obvious synergy/complementarity between the main focus of the project on energy with an added component on biodiversity.

Indigenous communities: Involvement of indigenous communities and ensuring 20% IRR do not appear congruent. The PIF states that by providing 1000 jobs, up to 6000 ha of forest land will be conserved. Does this mean indigenous communities are responsible for deforestation? Evidence with respect to the root causes of deforestation should be presented, and such evidence used to establish/support proposed actions in the project. STAP recommends assessing drivers of forest degradation during project preparation and use this information in the following project design.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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.
2. Minor revision required.	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: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues

	<p>(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 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>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<p>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.</p>