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: April 19, 2011 Screener: 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: 4500
PROJECT DURATION : 4
COUNTRIES : China
PROJECT TITLE: GEF Large-City Congestion and Carbon Reduction Project
GEF AGENCIES: World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Tranport
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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

The proposed project focuses on measures dealing with traffic congestion in selected large cities in China: Sizhou, Chengdu, and Harbin. The main goal of the project is to develop and demonstrate a set of comprehensive measures to address urban transportation problems including infrastructure, policies, economic incentives and capacity building, etc. Project interventions particularly emphasize a shift to public transport modes as the one and only way to reduce congestion in a sustainable manner. Transport demand management is proposed as a key element in a comprehensive package of interventions in public transit development.

1. The PIF does not provide sufficient information about the existing GHG baselines in the three cities nor does it provide justification for emphasizing transport modal shift to public transport as the only way to reduce GHG emissions from transportation in the selected cities. STAP's advisory document on sustainable low-carbon transport advocates that the best strategy for sustainable transport should be based on avoiding unnecessary journeys and reducing the length of trips, modal shift to low carbon transport, and improvements in carbon intensity of all transport modes. No single element of the framework will be more effective than more comprehensive approach across the three pillars of transport sustainability: Avoid-Shift-Improve (GEF-STAP (2010): Advancing sustainable low-carbon transport through the GEF, http://www.unep.org/stap/Portals/61/pubs/For%20website%20-%20Sustainable%20transport.pdf). If Avoid and Improve pillars of the strategy are avoided, the whole sustainability of the project could be compromised. If these interventions are supported from other sources than the GEF funds, the information should be provided. STAP recommends project proponents to provide justification of the selected approach focused on modal shift only (including baseline construction, reference scenario, analysis of modal share and policies) at the CEO endorsement stage.

2. STAP recommends assessment of potential barriers to the proposed package of interventions, so that targeted measures could be considered to overcome the identified and ranked barriers.

3. Project interventions could be short-lived if not mainstreamed into long-term strategic planning for the transport sector in the selected cities. STAP strongly recommends assisting selected municipalities in developing long-term transport strategies with defined objectives, targets/milestones and indicators supporting low-carbon transport development and taking into account multiple environmental and social-economic benefits of sustainable transport.

4. The PIF does not provide sufficient information on how GHG emissions will be calculated at the project design, implementation and evaluation. GHG monitoring issue need to be carefully considered, given the complexity in measuring the GHG impact of transportation interventions. How capacity building of national and municipal authorities to account for GHG emissions will be built and strengthened? The methodology proposed by STAP for GHG accounting methodology for transport sector (http://www.unep.org/stap/) should be considered and the use of alternatives if available should be explained.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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.	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: (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 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.
3. Major revision required	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. 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.