

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 08, 2012

Screeener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath
Consultant(s): Ralph E.H. Sims

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4909

PROJECT DURATION : 48

COUNTRIES : Global (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Cote d'Ivoire, China, Georgia, India, Jamaica, Montenegro, Mauritius, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Vietnam)

PROJECT TITLE: Stabilizing GHG Emissions from Road Transport Through Doubling of Global Vehicle Fuel Economy: Regional Implementation of the Global Fuel Efficiency Initiative (GFEI)

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: FIA Foundation (GFEI Secretariat)

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

Road transport fuel economy is covered by GEF Strategic Objective CCM-4. GEF support will enable 5 more countries to be supported above the current 15 being assisted by GFEI. STAP is supportive of this initiative, however notes the following issues that should be addressed during full project preparation:

Rationale: Vehicle fuel economy options are similar in most countries, so having 20 countries is appropriate. This is a good follow-up project to the earlier GEF project aimed at the development of tools. However, vehicle fuel consumption (l/100km) does not cover number of journeys, choice of mode, and carbon intensities of the alternative fuels. Small diesel-powered light duty vehicles (LDVs) can be more fuel efficient than hybrid vehicles of similar size, yet are not included. Details of how to access the on-line toolkit have not been included so its capability for the proposed purpose cannot be reviewed.

Baseline: It states (somewhat confusingly) in the project objective that 15 countries are "baseline" and the other 5 will be evaluated after introduction of fuel economy measures and policies. In effect this means the current fuel economy is the project baseline for these 5 countries, Peru, Jamaica, Montenegro, Mali and Mauritius. These will then be evaluated (for LDVs in terms of average fuel consumption as l/100km) then compared with results for the same countries after completion of the project. Disseminating the findings into other countries is a second phase.

Climate change abatement: Good mitigation potential exists across the vehicle fleets of the 20 countries, plus other countries yet to be included by GFEI.

Performance monitoring: No details are provided as to what level of fuel consumption reduction is the target for each of the 5 countries. The average age of the vehicle fleet and rate of stock turnover are important indicators to enable regional comparisons to be made. Is such data available for the five countries? The abilities of the tools to be used to undertake accurate monitoring are unknown and have to be specified.

No behavioral issues are discussed such as choice of vehicle for status, comfort, towing capacity, etc. as well as driver education. These factors are important when considering sustainability of project outcomes and could be addressed by the project activities.

<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 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: <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 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.