

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: 9th February 2010

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

GEF PROJECT ID: 3461

COUNTRY(IES): REGIONAL (KENYA, UGANDA AND ETHIOPIA)

PROJECT TITLE: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SOLUTIONS FOR EAST AFRICA

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UN-HABITAT, ITDP EUROPE, TRL, CITY COUNCILS OF ADDIS ABABA, KAMPALA AND NAIROBI

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): CLIMATE CHANGE

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): CC-SP 6

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. It is a very comprehensive project attempting to promote sustainable transport options (NMT, BRT, TDM and LUP), provide technical assistance and institutional support for planning and implementation of innovative urban transportation options to reduce GHG emissions and improve traffic conditions and public health. Transportation projects are very complex and difficult to implement, since it involves land use planning, major infrastructure investment and significant changes in policy making process. These challenges will have to be addressed and the proposed project could be an attempt to demonstrate the feasibility of promoting sustainable transport solutions in 3 important cities of Africa. Specifically, STAP suggests addressing the following issues during project preparation.
2. **Baseline Study:** A good baseline development is necessary to assess the GHG emissions, traffic congestion, fossil fuel consumption, and health status due to emission of pollutants.
3. **Barrier Analysis:** A good scientific barrier analysis would assist the three cities to identify and prioritize the city-specific barriers for technical, financial and policy interventions.
4. **Land Use Planning:** This is a very complex issue requiring possibly major changes or modifications to the existing infrastructure (roads, residential areas, parks etc.). There is a need for developing methodology/approach for land-use planning suitable for particular project conditions.
5. **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 UNEP with a copy of its forthcoming methodology¹ on the assessment of GHG emission reductions in GEF transportation projects. STAP would welcome consideration of the project capacity building measures in setting up enabling environment for measuring and monitoring GHG emissions in the transport sector of the selected cities/countries.
6. **Incremental Cost Assessment:** Transportation projects normally involve large investments. Thus, it is necessary to assess the incremental investment costs and the risks associated with securing the investment capital.

¹ *Methodology for measuring GHG impact of transport projects funded by GEF.* See STAP work program at 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>
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.	<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"> (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 <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>
3. Major revision required	<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>