

# 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: 17<sup>th</sup> March 2009

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID: 3827**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P114762**

**COUNTRY(IES): NIGERIA**

**PROJECT TITLE: NIGERIA URBAN TRANSPORT**

**GEF AGENCY(IES): WORLD BANK**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): FEDERAL MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND LAGOS STATE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT**

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S): CLIMATE CHANGE**

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO#7, SP#5**

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT : WEST AFRICA ENERGY PROGRAM**

**PROJECT PROMOTES SOUND CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT (IF APPLICABLE): YES  NO X**

### 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

STAP supports this Nigeria urban transport project to improve transport management capacity and enhance the efficiency of public transport systems in Lagos and Kano metropolitan areas. This is an important project dealing with transport systems in one of the worlds largest urban areas with high population growth and as such may have a high mitigation potential. The PIF lists a large number of complex barriers, however how these barriers will be addressed is not adequately presented. STAP has the following issues/suggestions that could be addressed at the CEO endorsement point:

1. The Project describes a number of formidable barriers including the absence of transport regulatory framework, fragmented institutional arrangements, lack of capacity and awareness among policy makers on sustainable transport options. While the project component 1 aims at improving local capacity to plan, implement, and monitor public transport services, it does not address the issue of the multiplicity of transport stakeholders in two cities and lack of the coordinated policy framework for planning and enforcement. There is a need for a scientific analysis of the barriers and ranking of them. A scientific method such as AHP could be adopted for identifying and ranking the barriers.
2. The PIF indicates that there are no related initiatives in the transport sector in Nigeria. However, the World Bank was instrumental in setting up Lagos Metropolitan Transport Authority (LAMATA) that implements the Lagos Urban Transport Project (LUTP) that aims to improve and sustain an efficient public transportation system in Lagos. LAMATA currently operates BRT corridor of 22 km length. How does project component 3 relate to the ongoing BRT efforts? What are the lessons learned and how are they to be used in the proposed development of the BRT system?
3. The project concept states that BRT system will facilitate a transport modal share shift. What criteria have been used in selecting this particular technological and policy intervention? Why other transport modes have been omitted? In addition to being the second most populous city in Africa, Lagos is also an end point of the three Trans-African highway routes and the port with extensive infrastructure. How project interventions related to capacity building take this into consideration?
4. Proponents are advised to analyze specific risks and response measures related to slow take-up of the BRT option.
5. During the project preparatory phase, detailed information on the baseline scenario including existing transportation framework and baseline emissions for both cities should be provided in order to evaluate potential project's impacts on GHG emissions.

<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>