

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS¹

Country/Region: Vietnam
 Project Title: Vietnam: Integrated Approaches for Sustainable Cities in Vietnam
 GEFSEC Project ID: **9484**
 GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: ADB
 GEF Focal Area (s): Multi Focal Area
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s):
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG: GEF Project Allocation: \$8,256,881 Co-financing: \$148,472,900 Total Project Cost: \$156,729,781
 PIF Approval Date: Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:
 Program Manager: Xiaomei Tan GEF Agency Contact Person: Hubert Jenny

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion ²	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		XT, May 16, 2016: Yes. Viet Nam together with 10 other countries were included in the Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot in June 2015.
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		XT, May 16, 2016: NO.
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		XT, May 16, 2016: Yes.
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?		XT, May 16, 2016: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot, which was approved by GEF Council in June 2015.
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?		XT, May 10, 2016: N/A.

¹ Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

² Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

	• The focal areas?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	• Strategic objectives?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	• Strategic program?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
Project Design	7. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?		
	8. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes. The project provided detailed estimates of direct and indirect GHG emission reductions. The methodology is sound.
	9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?		<p>XT, May 10, 2016: Not at this point.</p> <p>Component 1. Please articulate how the "strengthened city planning process" will</p> <p>1) Shape the urban form or the spatial distribution of urban activities in an efficient and inclusive way in three cities.</p> <p>2) Match land use with development plans of "four key sectors" green energy system and renewable energy, green transport, agriculture and sustainable waste management."</p> <p>3) Provide incentives to prioritize development in high potential areas and therefore mitigate the needs for urban sprawl.</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>4) Please articulate how integrated solid waste management strategy - reduce, reuse and recycle " will be applied to Ha Giang's waste project.</p> <p>5) Regarding anaerobic digestion, please clarify it is at the household level or at a concentrated plant.</p> <p>6) A business model that aggregates the demand for energy efficient lighting in Ha Giang and/or other cities could be developed to scale up the application.</p> <p>Component 3.</p>

			<p>7) Regional coordination among cities of different sizes and responsibilities is an effective way to share resources, facilitate territorial complementarities and enhance agglomeration economies. The Vinh Yen-Hanoi for example could benefit each other through sharing open spaces, landfills, transit systems and other urban amenities. This also applies to the Hue-Da Neng region.</p> <p>8) Please incorporate this regional coordination factor into the proposed "institutional environment" design.</p> <p>XT, Nov. 2, 2016: all comments cleared.</p>
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?		<p>XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.</p> <p>The project aligns with Viet Nam's Social-Economic Development Strategy 2011-2020 very well. Particularly, it will greatly contribute to the country's National Program on Urban Development 2012-2020.</p>
	11. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.</p> <p>The project is aligned with GEF Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot, CCM-2 Program 3 and BD-4 Program 9.</p> <p>Further, the project compliments the LDCF project, Promoting Climate Resilience in Vietnamese Cities Management.</p>
	12. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	<p>XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.</p> <p>The project suggests good value for money, as the estimated cost effectiveness of GHG emissions avoided is \$0.7-0.9 per tonne CO₂.</p> <p>GHG savings will be achieved by mainstreaming climate measures directly into urban planning and management as opposed to single sector approach.</p>	

	13.Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	14.Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	15.Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes. The project's key contribution is to integrate climate consideration into secondary cities' urban planning and design.
Justification for GEF Grant	16.Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	17.Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes. GEF grant will be matched by \$170 million loan to the three cities.
	18.How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		XT, May 10, 2016: There will be no systematic improvement of urban planning in Vietnam's secondary cities.
	19.Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.	
	20.Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	21.Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.	
	22.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	23.Has the Tracking Tool ³ been included with information for all relevant indicators?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	24.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.

³ At present, Tracking Tools apply to Biodiversity projects only. Tracking Tools for other focal areas are currently being developed.

Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	Convention Secretariat		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
	Agencies' response to Council comments		XT, May 10, 2016: Yes.
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	25. Is PIF clearance being recommended?		
	26.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	27. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		
Review Date	1 st review		
	2 nd review		
	3 rd review		

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 st review	
	2 nd review	
	3 rd review	

wb21049
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM