

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 10, 2013

Screeener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims
Consultant(s): Margarita Dyubanova

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5396

PROJECT DURATION : 6

COUNTRIES : Russian Federation

PROJECT TITLE: National Urban Transport Improvement Project

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Federal Ministry of Transport (Lead Partner), Cities of St. Petersburg, Lipetsk, and Balashikha

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

STAP acknowledges the project that has a goal to improve the quality and condition of urban transport in selected Russian cities and to reduce adverse environmental impacts. Physical investments, operational and technological improvements, and legal reforms can strengthen the institutional and technical capacity in planning and managing urban transport systems for the three selected Russian cities. These represent two cities with different populations and a satellite town of Moscow which is a sensible choice.

The project is implemented through three project components that focus on development of a National Framework for Urban Transport Systems; pilot projects; and capacity building . The goal, outcomes and outputs are consistent with the project issue. Description of the baseline clearly represents the barriers and GEF incremental support is to overcome them. The link with the current UNDP project on a similar topic is welcomed.

However, the proposal appears somewhat weak when describing some of the important scientific and technical characteristics:

1. This is a large project (over US\$ 9 million GEF grant and US\$262 million in co-financing) and before making \$220 M expenditure on improving infrastructure (item 2.1 on page 2), it requires a full evaluation of all transport options (as part of Component 1). A statistical analysis of the present usage of the various existing transport modes, and related trends in CO2 emissions, will also be useful. It is not clear whether this has been done before identifying the three pilot projects or whether some of the GEF funding could be utilized for this purpose. STAP's ex-ante GHG methodology for transportation projects could be a useful tool in considering mitigation impact of different transport options (<http://stapgef.org/greenhouse-gas-benefits-of-gef-projects>).

2. The proposal concentrates on the rapid growth of car ownership and the removal of barriers to achieve well integrated public transport systems for urban passengers. STAP recommends considering ways how to reform freight transport in the project towards lower carbon footprint.

3. The proposal lacks any outline of GHG monitoring and reviewing. What are the project impact indicators? Given the 6 year period, where are the milestones and timeline? Who will conduct an MRV process - and at what cost?

4. The city of Balashikha is located in close proximity to Moscow (6 km). As stated in the proposal, a quarter of the inhabitants commute to Moscow for work. It would seem to be logical to coordinate the development of the pilot project with Moscow municipality transport department officials.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<p>1. Consent</p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
<p>2. Minor revision required.</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.