

# 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: @@@@ @@, @@@@

Screeener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims

Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5321

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Myanmar

**PROJECT TITLE:** Improvement of Industrial Energy Efficiency

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNIDO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Environment Conservation and Forestry, Ministry of Energy etc.

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Climate Change

### 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. A "typical" UNIDO project supporting industrial EE through capacity building, support for policy and regulatory reform, ISO 50001 and Energy management system. Clearly presented with a logical and very readable text. Myanmar can learn fast on energy efficiency measures from other country experiences, especially aiming to reduce electricity demand in industry. Domestic energy use nor transport uses are included. This GEF project role is to help with policy development, capacity building, implement energy management case studies, and conduct MRV.

2. A sensible project with private sector funding sought (in-kind?) for two thirds of the total (\$8.8M of \$13.8M). Not clear how funding from private sector can be "in-kind" and could be explained?

3. The project addresses major legal, regulatory, capacity building, and indirectly through regulatory work "financial barriers. Acknowledging the country has a very low baseline in industrial EE, after setting up the legal, regulatory and institutional framework, the second most important bottleneck will be a lack of financing and appropriate business models supporting transfer of EE technologies. Recognizing the limited project resources available, STAP, recommends that project proponents assess technology transfer barriers; provide recommendations for legal, institutional and policy reform as well as for business models; and propose financial incentives and public-private partnership modalities conducive for the successful transfer of EE technologies for industries.

4. Based on other country experiences, successful energy management programmes in industry need support from the chief executive and an energy manager appointed, part-time in smaller organisations, to continually drive the programme and gain support from all staff, some of whom can see no benefit in changing their ways. How the project will secure such support and build respective capacity?

5. Reviewing the present subsidies on fossil fuels with the aim to replace them is paramount if energy efficiency programs are to be successful. Project proponents are recommended to consider appropriate support for continuing elimination of fossil fuel subsidies.

6. The training packages are a good option but they are fairly short time periods (half a day and 2 days) given the complexity of the topics to get the key messages across. From experience, such short courses need follow-ups with the attendees on their own business premises after a few weeks to reinforce the messages.

7. The STAP/GEF tool for calculating GHG emissions from energy efficiency projects should be utilized. This part of the proposal was the weakest. Component 4 on monitoring and evaluation is not described in section 3. The more detailed assessment of energy savings will no doubt consider CO2 evaluations as well as the possible impacts of the rebound effect and have to be completed during project preparation.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>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> <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>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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:            (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.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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:            (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.</p>