

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: 20th November 2008

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3539

UNDP PROJECT ID: 3953

COUNTRY(IES): PAKISTAN

PROJECT TITLE: PAKISTAN SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PROJECT

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN PLANNING COMMISSION, TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

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. STAP supports the Pakistan Sustainable transport project aimed at reducing GHG emissions associated with urban transportation. The project has multiple components namely; *consolidation of National Transport policy, establishment of BRT Corridors between Islamabad and Rawalpindi, introduction of School bus transportation system in Lahore and capacity building and awareness raising*. IPCC (2007), states that BRT system has relatively low capital and operational cost. IPCC is also cautious about the success of BRT in all the regions. The project has also rightly highlighted the co-benefits and implications for sustainable development in Pakistan. Provision of details of the Components and Activities and the specific barriers addressed would help project evaluation and implementation.
3. The STAP recommends the following suggestions to be considered by UNDP when further developing the project;
 - i. **Scientific Rationale for Technological Interventions and Innovations:** The project aims at consolidating the existing project policies, *implementation of bus rapid transport corridor and introduction of school bus transportation system*. There is a need for scientific criteria and justification for the selected technological interventions such as; BRT and School bus Transportation, along with other potential technological and policy interventions. The criteria could include mitigation potential (t CO₂), financial viability, cost-benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness of mitigation interventions (\$/tCO₂) and transaction costs. IPCC (2007) has highlighted the need for multiple initiatives to be addressed in the transportation sector including *Promotion of Public Transport, Improved Facility for Non-motorized Transport (Bicycle lanes), Regulatory and Financial Instruments to restrain car-ownership and use*, etc. The project could explore incorporation of other such Components. There is a need for consideration of evaluation of the existing multiple transportation policies as a part of the proposed consolidation efforts. The proposal could explore transport demand management concept. Policies and regulations to enforce the use of school buses could be considered.
 - ii. **Barriers to Promotion of Sustainable Transport:** The project proposal highlights several barriers namely; *policy and regulatory, institutional, absence of public transport infrastructure and services and lack of awareness*. The project could benefit from a scientific analysis of barriers aimed at identifying, ranking and prioritising the barriers to enable targeting of the policies to overcome the barriers.

- iii. **Baseline Scenario Emissions and Rate of Spread of Alternate Options:** The project could consider estimating and projecting the *Baseline Scenario emissions* from the transport sector for the cities and corridors selected for the project, which would enable evaluation of project impacts on GEBs.
- iv. **Risks and Mitigation Measures:** The risks associated with the poor response from parents of school children to use the school bus need to be consider along with the mitigation measure.

<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.