

Piloting innovative financing for climate adaptation technologies in medium-sized cities

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10433

Countries

Global

Project Name

Piloting innovative financing for climate adaptation technologies in medium-sized cities

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

5/21/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The proposal states "Efforts are being deployed by the UNIDO to remediate to the current situation and provide the letters at the earliest possible." Please elaborate on these efforts, in particular, what has been done so far and what will be done to ensure that the letters can be obtained in a timely manner. Also, please discuss further on "the earliest possible"; when is this expected? In addition, please explain how this delay /decrease in co-financing will affect overall project design. Furthermore, "current amount" of CTCN's in kind contribution is indicated as \$300k in the table in the para 1. However, according to an explanation about this figure elsewhere in the document it seems that this could be \$150k. Please clarify/correct the figure. GEF cannot count any co-finance that does not include a letter at the time of CEO Approval; thus it is encouraged to have more co-financing to be confirmed with letters at this stage, in order to get much closer to the amount that was indicated at PIF stage.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please elaborate and provide further justification on how will the project directly benefit surrounding cities. Please include in the explanation how expected results from the surrounding cities were calculated.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Overall sufficient. Please provide clarification on how ?23 times more? were calculated in para 8 (the proposal states that this is as shown below (Figure 3); however, Figure 3 does not seem to show this).

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- Sustainable Cities Impact Program Global Platform (SCIP-GP) funded by the GEF could be one of the ongoing initiatives this project can also consider as a baseline.
- Please provide some information on how three cities were selected amongst others to confirm the selection was done appropriately. Please include explanation on how the selection has been done without utilizing PPG budget for the selection of cities.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Para 158: Please elaborate on the 'responsibility' stated in this para. What is each institution responsible for? In addition, GEFSEC has at the PIF stage requested to consider including local entities as an executing agency by CEO Approval stage, after countries/cities are selected. This is to secure strong and proactive engagement from the local country/community and ensure knowledge and experience from the project remain with them. Please elaborate on how this has been done. Please also elaborate on why UNHabitat can be considered as local entity and how can it ensure strong and proactive engagement from the local country/community and ensure knowledge and experience from the project remain with them.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not very clear. Please elaborate or indicate where to look for such information.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not clear. Please refer to the comment in Section I-7.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Innovation:

- Please provide brief explanation on innovation to be advanced through each of the financing strategies conveyed in this proposal.

- Please clarify by when each Stage can be achieved. Also, please elaborate on how the project is designed to ensure that the project can successfully proceed to the higher Stages mentioned in 'Innovation' section of the proposal.

Sustainability:

Please elaborate on how the tools developed through the project will be 'sustained' beyond the project duration, including in terms of financial sustainability for continued. It is important that the local entities themselves can maintain, not just use, the tools themselves. Conditions surrounding the cities and underlying presumptions etc. can change over time. How can the project ensure the effectiveness of the tools beyond the project duration, and in changing conditions etc.

Scaling Up:

Please further consider opportunities to leverage existing platforms for cities, such as for example GPSC (Global Platform for Sustainable Cities), from the scaling and also knowledge management/sharing perspectives. GPSC is mentioned in the text, but not very clear on how this platform will be effectively used.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to the comment in Section II-12.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

It is not clear how the private sector will be engaged as a stakeholder, which is a requirement of projects supported through the GEF Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation. Please explain what strategies will be used to engage specific private sector actors through this project, including through the development and implementation of the innovative financing instruments mentioned in the section on innovation, as well as add them to the list in the stakeholder section of the proposal.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to the comment in Section II-3. Please clarify whether responsible entities stated after each component in para 158 will play and/or will be responsible for the execution or not.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to the comment in Section II-7.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

It is unclear how the budget stated in the proposal links with those in the Project Budget Table in Annex.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to Section II-17 on the budget.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please refer to the comment in Section II-2.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the update).

Also please check OFP endorsement letters. Some do not seem to be signed by the the current OFP.

https://www.thegef.org/focal_points_list

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		