

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



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

Date of screening: 04<sup>th</sup> February 2010

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information

GEF PROJECT ID: **4156**

COUNTRY(IES): **PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

PROJECT TITLE: **ECO-TRANSPORT IN CITY CLUSTERS: MODEL DEVELOPMENT & PILOTS**

GEF AGENCY(IES): **World Bank**

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): **MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT**

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): **Climate Change**

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): **CC SP-5**

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (IF APPLICABLE): **N/A**

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP consents to the project aimed at developing a sustainable transport strategy between cities within a city cluster. It is an innovative concept/project in the transport sector, since large cities are emerging along with a cluster of urban centers. The project has all the components: developing the strategy, its demonstration, capacity development and M&E. STAP commends the project proponents for such an inclusive and comprehensive framework.
2. **Features of city clusters:** What are the characteristic features of the city clusters, how needs of city clusters differ from the intra- or intercity transportation needs? Will there be any delimitation based on the distance or population size to distinguish them from "traditional" inter-city transport? How many such clusters exist in China for replicability? STAP recommends considering stronger links between project interventions at the local vs. national levels (policy, regulatory, technological, capacity building) to increase sustainability of interventions.
3. **Baseline Scenario:** What is the baseline scenario, what modes of transport exist and what is their efficiency and GHG emissions under the baseline/BAU scenario? With some degree of certainty this information is needed to be collected during project preparation to assess the impacts of the proposed alternatives.
4. **Methodology:** GEF is lacking a harmonized methodology for assessing GHG emission reductions in the baseline and GEF project scenario. STAP is currently working with the entire GEF partnership on the development of such methodology and will provide the World Bank with a copy of its forthcoming methodology<sup>1</sup> on the assessment of GHG emission reductions in GEF transportation projects. STAP would welcome consideration of the project capacity building component in setting up enabling environment for measuring and monitoring GHG emissions in the transport sector.
5. **Climate change risk:** Infrastructure developed in the transportation sector is normally a long term investment. If inland waterways are going to be integrated, the potential impacts of climate change could be considered and if necessary adaptation component could be integrated. STAP recommends exploring climate change risks and potential adaptive potential of transport measures at the project preparation stage.

<sup>1</sup> *Practice guide on combustion and emerging non-combustion technologies for POPs in developing countries*, See STAP work program at [http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF\\_C.35\\_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf](http://stapgef.unep.org/docs/Activities/STAPWPDocs/GEF_C.35_Inf.11%20STAP%20Work%20Program%20FY10.pdf).

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>