

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 04, 2012

Screeners: 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: 4921

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : India

PROJECT TITLE: Efficient and Sustainable City Bus Services

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India; other State Governments

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

This project promotes low-carbon bus transport systems by reviewing relevant policies and improving existing bus services including policy evaluation and capacity building. This meets the GEF Strategic Objective CCM-4 and the Indian government's National Urban Transport Policy.

Upon review of the PIF, STAP urges that the following set of issues be addressed before CEO endorsement of this project:

1. Rationale: The project aims at upgrading the existing bus service and customer facilities, and introducing services where they do not exist. Where state governments manage the public bus service, what role do most local (city) governments have? Who, for example, would invest in, administer and police a bus rapid transit (BRT) route? For all the cities expected to take up low-carbon transport systems, do public buses represent the best option? Have light rail and other alternatives been considered as well?

The proposal states that "4-6" demonstration cities are planned (there is some confusion on this point as the PIF also states 4-5 cities). What are the criteria for selection? What will determine whether some cities are chosen where bus services exist and others currently without buses? GEF funding to support four demonstration projects will be obviously less than for six. Description of selection criteria for demonstration sub-projects are recommended at the CEO endorsement stage.

2. Baseline: Several demonstration projects are already in place: 61 cities have received government funding for upgrading their bus fleets and in addition GEF-4 supported five city demonstration projects. What are the preliminary lessons from these initiatives and how are they utilized in project preparation? What are the likely outcomes before it is completed in 2014? It is hard to judge how this project might "deepen and take forward" earlier initiatives if the outcomes of these are not presented or fully known. Assessing the incremental benefits resulting from this GEF proposal will be difficult without this information and justification.

Quantification is needed of possible outputs. The number of existing buses introduced under recent support schemes (>15,000) is given. What additional number will result from this project? What indicators will be used to evaluate GEF funded incremental costs? Will project proponents assess current passenger numbers with future numbers? Will length of journeys also be considered?

Fuel consumption should be compared on a per passenger kilometer basis to be useful. The proposal mentions liters per year and l/100km, but these will be impacted by the number of passengers carried so are of little comparative value as

indicator. The shares of total journeys for each mode will also be useful “ before and after changes resulting from the GEF project. Are such data available? Who will collect and update these project indicators? STAP recommends addressing these issues and use GEF transportation methodology developed recently.

3. Demonstration cities: It is not clear whether the intention is to use all the bus services within a city boundary for the demonstration project or to select certain routes. "Pilot projects" and "pilot cities" are used throughout the proposal. Is there a difference between pilots and demonstrations?

4. Barrier removal: Several similar initiatives have been in place for several years. It is critical that experiences from these are evaluated and built upon if optimum value-for-investment is to be achieved from this GEF project. To further improve bus services will result in higher fares to cover higher operating costs unless the transport mode is subsidized. Has this been evaluated in terms of passenger uptake? Did proponents assess social preferences for certain transport modes among different societal groups? How are the cost, convenience, preference for independence and privacy, poor standard of buses, lack of comfort, viewed by those who are regular passengers and those who are not?

Training is an important component of the project. But who will undertake the training of drivers to be more fuel efficient and mechanics to better maintain the vehicles? How will the trainers be trained? What incentives might be needed for encouraging drivers to upgrade their skills? Will newly employed drivers and mechanics also be trained as turn-over of existing staff occurs?

5. Climate change abatement and risks: Some of the issues to be considered include - to what level more buses reduce local air pollution including black carbon emissions; what are the GHG emissions per passenger km from a diesel-engine buses compared with private cars or motorbikes that they might displace?

<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. <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>