

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 05, 2010

Screeener: 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: 4164

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Seychelles

PROJECT TITLE: Grid-Connected Rooftop Photovoltaic Systems

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Seychelles Energy Commission (Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Transport) and Public Utilities Corporation (PUC)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: CC-3;

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

This project aims at the increased use of grid-connected roof top PV systems for generating electricity in the islands of Seychelles. The project is comprehensive in terms of inclusiveness for policy and legal framework development, technology demonstration and capacity building. STAP supports this project and makes a few suggestions to be taken into account during project document preparation:

1. Barrier analysis: The project presents a clear set of barriers and has also developed a targeted set of measures to overcome the barriers. The project rightly recognizes legal, regulatory and policy as key barriers to promotion of PV systems. But there is a need to assess the financial viability of PV systems before implementing strategies to overcome legal, regulatory and policy barriers.
2. Grid-connected: What is the rationale for focusing only on grid-connected rooftop photovoltaic systems? Why have off-grid photovoltaic systems for households and small establishments not been considered? Off-grid photovoltaic systems may be more economically feasible since the cost of grid interface could be avoided. Since this is a demonstration project, it may be desirable to demonstrate and monitor off-grid photovoltaic systems as well.
3. Capacity of the systems and end users: Power capacity of the systems is critical in determining the financial viability of PV systems. Thus it is necessary to conduct a systematic analysis to identify financially viable capacities for PV systems. Who will be the dominant users of the solar power generated, particularly in the small islands?
4. Financial viability and investment cost: Large scale spread of SPV systems depends on the investment and O&M costs. What is the strategy to reduce the cost of the PV systems beyond the 3 demonstration units?
5. Baseline scenario: There is a need to develop a baseline scenario estimating the current and projected dependence on fossil fuels and the associated GHG emissions. This would enable calculation of the net GHG benefits of the current project.

<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 emphasizing 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>