

# 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: October 07, 2011

Screeners: Lev Neretin

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4638

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Bangladesh, China, Mongolia)

**PROJECT TITLE:** ASTUD Asian Sustainable Transport and Urban Development Program (PROGRAM)

**GEF AGENCIES:** ADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**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): **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP provides consent and commends ADB for submitting so well conceptually designed and structured proposal. It sets to bar high for other GEF interventions in the transport sector. STAP particularly notes PFD adherence to the conceptual ASI framework and its application to model cities, detailed definition of baselines and investment in data collection and monitoring of GHG emissions, attempt to account for co-benefits, consideration of adaptation and mitigation linkages in the transport sector and, overall, significant potential for transformation of transport sector in Asia. STAP notes long-term aspirations of the program with the intention to submit additional projects as existing projects progress and lessons learned as well as its strong foundation in the ADB STI baseline activities aimed at regional and global knowledge management. It is commendable that ADB estimates the GHG benefit under the baseline scenario interventions and separately for the GEF interventions.

2. STAP expresses its interest to be informed about project outcomes and developments in order to verify and update existing GEF methodology for transport sector. It is understood that this program will generate a range of socio-economic benefits which are local but fundamental ingredient in decision-making for transportation sector. STAP encourages project proponents to make attempts to systematically analyze and collect data about these co-benefits with an intention to be considered in the updated GEF GHG methodology and beyond.

3. While the program engages and consults with a range of stakeholders ranging from national governments and industries to multilateral organizations and UNFCCC bodies, lessons learned and tools and methods developed would be of interest to the GEF itself and could help in developing further its transport and urban program. STAP recommends exploring ways of how this program contributes to knowledge management for GEF and its agencies and secure such links at the early stage.

4. It is understood that project focuses its interventions at the city level but these interventions will have an impact on countries obligations for UNFCCC and respective mitigation strategies including NAMAs. How project interventions and results and lessons will be fed into national mitigation strategies, plans and policies?

5. Climate change risks: Climate risks are recognized. Adaptation measures are mentioned in the PIF. However, under "Indicate Risks; including climate change" climate risks to transportation risks are not mentioned. STAP suggests reference to World Bank's report on, "Climate Change Impacts on Energy Sector" by Ebinger and Vergara (2011). This World Bank report states "Energy services and resources will be increasingly affected by climate change - Changing trends, increasing variability, greater extremes, and large inter-annual variations in climate parameters. The report provides approaches and methods to assess impacts and options to address the climate risks in energy sector.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>