

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: 11-3-2008

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member Review by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3177

UNDP PROJECT ID: 2390

COUNTRY(IES): Iran

PROJECT TITLE: Facilitating Sustainable Mobility in Tehran

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Tehran Transportation and Traffic Organization (TTTO)

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): Promoting sustainable innovative systems for urban transport

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: n/a

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

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

2. **i) Technical Interventions:** The proposal seems to be very interesting and deserves support for its implementation. The latest report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2007) has concluded that providing public transport systems and their related infrastructure and promoting non-motorized transport can contribute significantly to GHG mitigation. However, local conditions determine how much transport can be shifted to less energy-intensive modes. Occupancy rates and the primary energy sources of the transport modes further determine the mitigation potential. The energy requirements of urban transport are strongly influenced by the density and spatial structure of the built environment, as well as by the location, extent and nature of the transport infrastructure. Large-capacity buses, light-rail transit and metro or suburban rail are increasingly being used for the expansion of public transport. Bus Rapid Transit systems have relatively low capital and operational costs, but there are uncertainties regarding the potential success in all the developing countries.
ii) Methods and Models: The methods and models that will be used for the planning process for developing an integrated public transport master plan for Tehran needs to be considered. Further, what methods will be used for developing hierarchical public transport system? How will the modal shifts from private cars to BRT systems be measured and monitored.
iii) Investment cost and financial viability: The investment cost of comprehensive and integrated transportation and master plan, modal shifts, implementation of BRT corridor etc, needs to be considered. The benefit cost ratio or financial viability of the interventions and investments could also be included.
iv) Baseline and Control Groups: The baseline scenario with respect to transportation network, energy use and the GHG emissions needs to be provided. It may be desirable to consider methods for estimating GHG emissions in the baseline or control scenario in the absence of GEF project for assessing the impacts on GHG emissions.
v) Barriers and Risks: The risk and barriers relevant to investment costs could be considered and will the GEF support be adequate to overcome the investment barrier.

Reference: IPCC, 2007, Climate Change; Mitigation of Climate Change.

STAP advisory	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
---------------	--

<i>response</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.