

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 03, 2010

Screeners: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Bo Wahlstrom
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4102

PROJECT DURATION : 2.5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan)

PROJECT TITLE: Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase-out in the CEIT Region

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Ozone Units (NOUs) in partner countries.

GEF FOCAL AREA: Ozone Depleting Substances

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: ODS-1;

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

STAP expresses its consent to this project aimed at the assistance to five non-EU CEIT to implement Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out requirements. Project's emphasis on institutional strengthening, legal support and capacity building as well as some country-specific investment is welcome. The following issues/concerns are recommended for consideration before the CEO endorsement:

1. The major challenge in ODS reduction in the region is to limit demand for ODS-containing equipment and services. This task cannot be achieved without strong and lasting government support for National Ozone Units (NOUs). This project provides substantial assistance through capacity building and training aimed, inter alia, at NOUs personnel. Project document should provide more explicit information on the activities to assure longer-term government support for NOUs in terms of their institutional and financial sustainability.
2. The project does not sufficiently show how it aims to achieve integration between ODS regulation and management with the overall regulation and management of chemicals in the framework to promote SCM. Project need to identify activities/measures contributing to such integration.
3. ODS shipping through transit countries is a growing concern in non-EU CEIT. How will the project strengthen regional legal and institutional mechanisms of ODS trade through transit countries?
4. GEF Impact Evaluation of the Phase-Out of ODS in CEIT noted the lack of investments in halon management and banking as one of the ODS portfolio deficiencies. How is the problem expected to be addressed in the proposed project?
5. Successful engagement of private sector companies in ODS management is an important factor in this types of projects. PIF is ambiguous in providing a clear set of criteria for selecting companies for investment demonstrations and other types of support as a part of the project Component 2. STAP suggests selecting companies based on their positive track record in profitability and innovation, growth potential and environmental performance.
6. Analysis of project risks is insufficient and a comprehensive assessment of risks and how they will be addressed is expected at the CEO endorsement stage (ie., institutional and financial sustainability of NOUs, lack of private sector support, transboundary and transit trade in ODS, ODS stocks held by private companies and those without proper oversight and etc.).

<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>