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**STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)**

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**

**GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5152

**PROJECT DURATION:** 3

**COUNTRIES:** Yemen

**PROJECT TITLE:** Delivering the Transition to Energy Efficient Lighting

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Public Electricity Corporation

**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**

Well thought through project balancing phasing in of CFLs and LEDs but maintaining quality of lighting, avoiding poor quality of products through the test centres, and considering disposal of old light bulbs. The UNEP "en-lighten" initiative has been a successful driver and this project builds upon that. This initiative is very similar to Project 5150 for Chile. Hence, comments below are also similar to the screen for the Chile project. STAP has the following comments to be considered during project preparation:

1. Almost half the total budgeted funding going towards policies and legal and regulatory frameworks with emphasis on LEDs makes good sense.

2. Page 7. CO2 reductions should be "almost 3 Mt CO2" and not "3 TWh". Is this based on the present electricity generation mix or on how that mix might evolve out to 2030?

3. The future mix of 85% CFLs, 5% LEDs and 10% incandescent lamps is fine but, given the problems of mercury when disposing of CFLs, a higher share of LEDs could be a good target to aim for. Leap-frogging to 90% LEDs would be innovative but probably impractical. It would be interesting to compare a project proposal budget aiming for higher shares of LEDs and hence avoiding large investments in waste management of spent CFL lamps.

4. It’s not clear what will be actually measured/monitored in order to assess the project success (or otherwise). Could it be the number of CFLs/LEDs sold by a certain date? Or the number actually installed? Robust M&E system is strongly recommended for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Consent</strong></td>
<td>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. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Minor revision required.</strong></td>
<td>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Major revision required**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP’s recommended actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>