

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: 9 October 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3541

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY: The Russian Federation

PROJECT TITLE: Phase out of HCFCs and promotion of HFC-free Energy Efficient Refrigeration and Air-conditioning systems in the Russian Federation through technology transfer.

GEF AGENCY: UNIDO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER:

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): OZONE DEPLETION SUBSTANCES, CLIMATE CHANGE AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): ODS-SP1, CLIMATE CHANGE-SP6, TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Strategic Program on Technology Transfer

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. The project aims at phase out of HCFCs and promotion of HCFC-free energy efficient refrigeration and air conditioning systems in the Russian Federation through technology transfer. STAP recommends this project given the large potential for promoting GHG mitigation through energy efficient technologies for air conditioning and refrigeration. It is a very comprehensive project covering various critical aspects of promoting technology transfer. It is very important to ensure that low cost HCFC phase out technologies are also energy efficient and lead to reduced GHG emissions. How this will be ensured is a critical issue and needs to be adequately addressed in the project.
3. The proposal deals extensively with the ODS phase out component, but lacks detail on the energy efficient technology transfer component and the GHG mitigation issue.
4. The climate "impact" phrase used in the proposal may be confusing since impact has a different meaning in climate change projects. It may be preferable to use the term Climate mitigation or GHG reduction.
5. The proposal talks about "redesigning and retooling". This needs clarification, does it involve R&D? What is the timeframe for redesigning, field testing and performance monitoring? Are there not designs already available in EU countries? Do they need redesigning to fit Russian conditions?
6. There is a need for a Baseline scenario for GHG emissions from ACs and refrigerators.
7. What are the cost implications of redesigning and retooling for the ACs and refrigerators? If incremental costs are involved, what is the incentive for industry to shift to the new designs?
8. There is a need for increased attention for the steps and approaches for promoting technology transfer and market development. Lessons learnt from similar projects already implemented which aimed at promoting EE in ACs and refrigerators need to be incorporated.
9. A project of this large scale should conduct a detailed scientific assessment of barriers from the perspective of different stakeholders, rank and prioritize them for interventions.

<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.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (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 <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 revision required	<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.</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>