

## Sustainable Cities Impact Program Global Platform (SCIP-GP)

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10452

**Countries**

Global

**Project Title**

Sustainable Cities Impact Program Global Platform (SCIP-GP)

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01795

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

# PIF

## CEO Endorsement

Part I – Project Informatic

### 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

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

Yes, the project remain aligned with the program framework document of the sustainable cities impact program and the concept note of the global project.

#### 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

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The project design is appropriate with a clear focus on integrated urban planning to support sustainable urban development. The project outcomes and outputs are well aligned with the overall design of the PFD and aims to support achievement of the overall goals of the SCIP by providing value added support to child project cities on integrated planning, creating and disseminating cutting edge knowledge and building partnerships to scale up urban sustainability across cities globally to deliver large scale global environmental benefits.

The project's city engagement strategy indicates that it will engage with GEF 6 SCIAP cities and strategic non-GEF cities in its capacity building activities and other leadership engagement activities. Please indicate if these additional cities are factored in the outputs and targets under different project components.

GEFSEC 24 May 2020

Thanks. Comments cleared.

### **Agency Response**

21.5.20

Additional cities are included in outputs and targets, but not always explicitly. In responding to your question we have now provided more clarity in the table in the proposed alternative section on page 25 of the CEO Endorsement Document identifies which city categories will be targeted by output. We have added an additional column to this table to provide more detail on how cities will be engaged in each category in response to this question. We have also included a foot note in Annex A that the targets include GEF 6, 7 and additional cities.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The co-financing is adequately documented and supporting evidences have been provided. The co-financing classification is also in line with GEF's co-financing guidelines.

Comments cleared.

**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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The financing presented demonstrate a cost-effective approach. The project utilizes SCIP set aside funds and proposes to use it strategically to promote integrated urban planning for urban sustainability by effectively coordinating between child projects and delivering outcomes for the SCIP program which are more than sum of parts of each child projects.

The budget distribution across project components is justified.

Please see following outstanding comments on the budget proposed:

1. The budget class for ICLEI and C40 has been indicated as "Transfers of Grants to Implementation partners". Two points here. First, please clarify why is it different given that they are also executing partners of the project. Second, the classification doesn't really indicate a budget class but rather a modality. This column is to indicate what GEF is buying from the fund. So, the budget class should be something similar to staff and personnel, consultancy charges, or any specific purpose.

2. Similar to above, contract services is not a budget class but a modality. Please indicate the expenditure head i.e. what will the contracts buy?

3. As indicated in the project design, the project is likely to engage more partners and experts downstream for project delivery. Please indicate how they will be engaged e.g. procurement of services downstream, grants, etc.

May 24, 2020

Thanks for the details. Please see additional comments:

- It is understood that WRI will be the main executing agency and ICLEI and C40 will receive sub-grants through WRI. While WRI as a global organization indeed has necessary financial control measures, as the implementation agency, it is critical for UNEP as the GEF Agency to have an oversight of the process to ensure accountability and transparency. We noted the response below in this regard which explains this role " UNEP implementation rules require WRI to use their own procedures for project financial management, reporting back regularly to UNEP on the use of those funds. The WRI financial management procedures must meet minimum international standards for transparency, accountability and value for money, consistent with minimum criteria laid out by UNEP and GEF. UNEP conducts due diligence on partners to ensure their procedures adhere to these minimum criteria before entering into partnership". This is indicated for potential partnership with other organizations." The Agency is requested to include this detail in the project coordination section.

- As mentioned earlier, the budget category needs to indicate what is bought from the fund. The category of transfer of grants is a modality and not a budget category. If the transfer will be used for staff, personnel, consultant or experts, please indicate that in the budget category. This will make the column consistent with other budget categories.

- Please revise the contract services also similarly to explicitly indicate nature of services to be bought.

- Thanks for the details regarding sub-contractors and partners which is clear. However, please indicate how this is reflected in the budget table. The budget codes are primarily for staff and personnel cost of the four executing agencies in addition to overheads.

GEFSEC May 28, 2020

Thanks for revising the budget category, which is fine.

Regarding sub-contractors and partners, it is understood that WRI, ICLEI and C40 will procure their services or do fund transfer as and when appropriate during project implementation. Given the dynamism in cities and lessons learned from situations such as the COVID-19 pandemic, it is critical that project has flexibility and adopts adaptive management. Therefore, it is recommended that the project funding has clear budgetary provisions to accommodate such circumstances. In this regard, please provide an estimate of the amount of funds that is available for services to be procured during implementation and an indication of where those funds are located in the proposed budget.

GEFSEC 9 June 2020

Thanks for your response.

It's good to note that the project will factor in COVID and similar challenges which have direct implication on urban sustainability and integrated approaches. However, we would like to see how this is reflected in the approach to delivery of the overall SC program. The flexibility offered under the \$2 million of overheads budget and the contingency institutional mechanism for possible major revisions does not provide strong assurance for this. Rather, our expectation is that a proportion of the budget allocated to core partners will go toward potential adjustments or demand-driven shifts needed during program implementation. Such adjustments or shifts could be decided based on guidance from the Steering Committee and inputs from the PEG. Please indicate the proportion of funds in the budget that will be subject to such adjustment or shift, and also provide a short narrative.

We also understand that the experts/positions proposed for the project execution by the four organizations will lead to increasing their capacity and will be deployed exclusively for this project. A line of confirmation will be appreciated in this regard.

GEFSEC June 19, 2020

Thanks for the details regarding the budget flexibility in the project. To ensure that this flexibility is embedded within the project governance, we recommend that the budget and work plan review is included in the terms of reference of the Project Steering Committee. The terms of reference of the Executive Management Team can be modified accordingly.

GEFSEC also noted recent change in the coordinator position for Indonesia and recommends that the change is reflected in the project document.

GEFSEC 25 June, 2020

Thanks. Comments cleared.

## **Agency Response**

21.5.20

1. ICLEI and C40 are treated differently in the budget because WRI is the project lead Executing Agency and will receive the project funds. They will manage and report on the project finances to UNEP. In turn they will transfer part of the funds they receive to C40 and ICLEI as transfers. The nomenclature used in its budget category by UNEP is Transfers of Grants to Implementing Partners. We now have unpacked as requested the Transfers of Grants to Implementing Partners for ICLEI and C40 to the next budget category level and reflected this in the revised budget in the CEO Endorsement Document. Within each additional budget line we have now included the input codes for the line along with the description of the code.

2. Regarding the contract services, we have included contracts for each output and each organisation. For each of these contacts we have includes input codes together with a description of the codes in the budget. This shows what inputs will be bought under the contracts, with

the GEF funds.

3. Engagement of partners; (1) *subcontractors*: WRI, ICLEI and C40 will advertise, select and enter into agreement with subcontractor for project works according to their own procedures, adhering to minimum standards; (2) *project partners*: another category of partners are project partners managed through the Partnerships Engagement Group (PEG). The PEG looks for partners with common interests. The project does not expect to pay these partners but seeks to partner with them based on mutual benefits that can accrue from such partnership. It is possible that such partnerships could evolve into contract with funds transfers, and such a transition in this relationship would be governed by the Executing Agencies rules on contracts, described above.

UNEP implementation rules require WRI to use their own procedures for project financial management, reporting back regularly to UNEP on the use of those funds. The WRI financial management procedures must meet minimum international standards for transparency, accountability and value for money, consistent with minimum criteria laid out by UNEP and GEF. UNEP conducts due diligence on partners to ensure their procedures adhere to these minimum criteria before entering into partnership.

The project does have a procurement plan and WRI will be expected to follow this plan and manage C40 and ICLEI's use of funds according to the plan as well. We have procedures that allow for changes to the plan including prior approval and budget revisions.

#### 26.5.20

- The suggested paragraph has been added in the coordination section as a footnote, and in Annex H Project Implementation Arrangements as a paragraph.

- The UNEP internal (UMOJA) budget categories have been replaced by more explicit budget categories. Therefore, the "Transfer of grant" category is no longer used.

- Similarly, the "Contract services" UMOJA category has been replaced by more explicit budget categories reflecting what is bought, such as "Trainings and Meetings", "Materials development/publications", and others. The more detailed descriptions are still indicated in the last columns on the right of the table.

- The sub-contractors are reflected in the budget. When funds are going to WRI, ICLEI, C40 or UNEP, this is indicated in the budget. We did not foresee specific budget lines for transferring resources to additional partners, however we have the flexibility, through a budget revision to do so. Funds for this would be reallocated from budget lines currently allocated to WRI, ICLEI, C40 and UNEP cities.

#### 4.6.20

Thank you for this additional question. We agree that COVID-19 has brought additional uncertainty to the design and implementation of this project, and that we should anticipate contingencies, adaptation and changes in city priorities. We would like to explain that none of the project resources are *unallocated*, although some resources are *outsourced*. We have allocated all project resources as clearly as possible so that you at the GEFSEC can see how GEF funds are being used and what you are paying for. We have believed this to be an important principle of project design, to bring clarity to all partners to CBOs, to the other IAs and the cities themselves as we begin to discuss with them the 'global offer' that the global child project will bring to them.

We have also been working on the principle that we have partnered with ICLEI, C40, and WRI on because they are among the best executing partners to work with on city issues, and that they bring a wealth of strengths, city networks, experience and skills to the execution of this project. So, it has been natural to allocate the majority of the project resources to these organisations, to leverage their strengths,

experience and skills in executing this project.

We also absolutely agree with many discussions we have had internally, with the CBOs and you at the GEFSEC, that partnerships are an essential strength of the programme. Our assumption for the basis for these partnerships remains on mutual interest and synergies in working together, and less to do with funds transfer and contracting partnerships.

Even before COVID-19, a strong principle of project design was to respond to city needs and global trends and we have designed a process to identify these topics and bring flexibility to the project. The following actions will be undertaken, as part of the adaptive management approach:

- **Responding to cities' needs and challenges:** The Global Project Team will participate in IA child projects missions (or conduct remote interviews, during the travel restrictions) to undertake a City Needs Assessment, including an assessment on COVID-19 response and recovery challenges and needs;
- **Main liaison per country:** The GP will set up Regional (Country) Coordinators as the main project liaisons to establish contact and maintain regular dialogue with both national governments and SCIP cities. This will ensure that the Global Project Team is in a position to be able to promptly identify new priorities flagged as needs, and inform the team of such, in order to refine the support offer, (providing the right support, at the right time and to the right people).
- **Continuous identification of global city trends:** We also recognise the need to capture global city trends in selecting training and meeting topics, and these topics will be coming from the project engagement group and global meetings. All this information will inform topics of the selection of regional training and global meetings.

We see two areas where the project will most likely need to adapt to changing realities.

- The topics on integrated planning defining the training offer of the global platform may need to be adjusted according to changing priorities of local urban actors in the SCIP cities through the mechanisms stated above.
- Where some of the planned capacity development activities cannot be delivered due to changing circumstances, the budget allocated to outsourced activities of the Global Platform can be reallocated. Approximately USD 2 million will be outsourced to procure services in: **materials development** (such as translation, publication and design of knowledge products); and **regional trainings and global meetings** (logistics, catering, venue, translation, IT support, printing). Outsourcing gives flexibility in who and how specific activities can be done to reach the same results (impacts). By remaining flexible and reviewing the adjustments on an annual basis, the necessary re-allocations will ensure the SCIP program remains impactful and relevant, achieving its main objectives.

For example, if COVID-19 continues longer than anticipated (or a similar crisis emerges) international travel would be affected. In response, resources from Regional City Academies could be re-allocated for online training courses, expanded online knowledge resources or enhanced bespoke technical assistance support to participating cities.

Finally, if changing project circumstances require a major revision to project design, it has the institutional arrangements for a wide range of consultative approaches to do this. The Executive Management Group has the authority to initiate a project major revision and can do so through the consultation with the Project Steering Committee, the Partnership Engagement Group and the Regional Coordinators.



15.6.20

We agree that flexibility and adaptive management continue to be incredibly important; and the greater the uncertainty the more important this becomes. Building on our previous response, which has outlined the range of processes, methodologies and approaches we have in place for adaptive management, we here address your point about how the project will respond to the recommendations from the Steering Committee and the Partnership Engagement Group (PEG). The GP's design offers flexibility in two ways:

**a) Substance Flexibility.** Mechanisms for flexibility in re-allocating resources responding to changing SCIP city or global trends requirements on topics, themes, substance and approaches to project work and to shift activities and priorities have been embedded in project design, both from bottom-down and top-down, in the following ways:

- Partnership Engagement Group (PEG): the PEG will provide ideas and recommendations about evolving global trends on urban development that could improve project implementation. We will organize the first PEG meeting right after the CEO endorsement is approved to open up the floor for ideas at this early stage. The timing of the first PEG meeting has been moved up to respond to your question on how to have meaningful consultations and opportunities for partnerships from project start. The GP now plans to hold a PEG early on as a way to gauge not only global trends but also to respond to the SCIP cities' needs, by tailor-making (and if needed adjusting) the training categories before approaching the cities with the final GP offer of support. This will give a high degree of flexibility to the PEG meeting in influencing training topics, approaches and methodologies for training.

- Light-touch City Needs Assessments: Through the planned Light-touch City Needs Assessment to be carried out during the PPG phase of the SCIP, participant cities will signal which topical areas and types of capacity building fits their needs and current challenges (e.g. Post COVID-19 recovery). In addition, the Light touch City Needs Assessment will provide a baseline of local government context and background information that contributes to project implementation. The Light-touch City Needs Assessment will be conducted after the first PEG meeting takes place, to incorporate ideas harvested during the PEG into the city assessments.

- Steering Committee: As part of the governance of the programme, the SC will provide inputs about overall project implementation and how it can be improved on a periodic basis.

All these inputs can potentially lead to adjustments in activities and topics directed towards capacity building, technical assistance, knowledge sharing and global advocacy efforts, that will then be reflected in work plans and budget. Changes can affect the project implementation in two ways:

- Simply changing the direction of existing activities, such as training topics, the location of a training event, or even the approach of a training event;
- Proposing activities that had not been programmed, and that would require swapping out new activities for existing ones, such as dropping a planned training event in favour of a new activity set.

**b) Budget Flexibility:** The CBOs and UNEP are prepared to partner when interesting opportunities arise that will strengthen the delivery of outcomes and outputs of the SCIP. To that end the design of the project has identified concrete activities that are not fixed for implementation by the CBOs and UNEP, and can be contracted to outside partners, if this is a better alternative. These are substantive areas of work (on top the other 2M contracts that have been identified in the previous response<sup>[1]</sup>), which include:

- In country implementation of SCIP Labs (Strategic Planning and Data Workshops)
- Content experts for SCIP Regional Forums and City Academies, and Global Events
- Experts to develop content for training modules in content design
- External experts and delivery of the city business marketplaces
- Experts and delivery of SCIP investors roundtables
- Light touch technical assistance to city projects for finance component
- Case studies for private sector component
- Communications experts for Climate Commitments

We have identified budget flexibility of around USD 1 million which can be drawn from the following budget lines:

W-0105	City Academy Regional Forum External experts
W-0106	SCIP Forum Experts
W-0110	Strategic Planning and Data Workshops - Local experts for training
W-0113	Technical Expert in Urban Resilience And Nature-Based Solutions [content, revision, training materials, adaptation to web]
I-0109	Urban Development Specialists
U-0106	City business marketplaces
W-1205	Strategic Planning and Data Workshops
C-1203	Design, preparation and implementation of investors roundtables
C-1204	Light touch technical assistance for 9 projects
C-1206	Contract Services Private Sector Case Studies Publication
C-1207	Communication and engagement package on Climate Action Commitments - Consultant Services
C-1208	Design, preparation and implementation of city-business marketplaces
I-1403	Regional Office Experts Transfer to ICLEI regional/country office to cover for experts

These changes can be seen in Annex H.

Regarding the dedicated staff working for the project, as explained in Annex K, which details the Terms of Reference of project staff, there is

a core group that will be fully dedicated to the project (this includes the chief and senior technical advisors, regional coordinators, and communications lead). Other necessary positions will be filled with a % of time of staff dedicated to the project, responsible for specific tasks (administrative and financial staff, gender specialists, technical experts). However common across the CBO's and UNEP is the rule that existing staff will be utilised internally if they have both the right expertise and the time available to complete deliverables on time. When this is not the case the CBOs and UNEP will either hire new staff or outsource. Please see below the table with the estimated percentage of time for each staff profile for this project. It includes information on planned new hires as well. Note that the core substantive team positions are full time or almost full time (80 to 100%), while there is a mixed approach by the CBO's and UNEP in recruiting new staff/consultant's versus using their own staff that will be assigned to work specifically for the project based on a clear set deliverables.

Position	% dedication	New hire
WRI PROJECT DIRECTOR	15% of time over 5 years	
WRI CHIEF TECHNICAL ADVISOR	100% of time over 5 years	
WRI COMMUNICATIONS LEAD	100% of time over 5 years	X
WRI GENDER LEAD	10% of the time over 5 years	
WRI GRANTS AND FINANCE SPECIALIST	50% of the time over 5 years	
WRI KNOWLEDGE AND PARTNERSHIPS OFFICER	90% of the time over 5 years	
WRI TECHNICAL EXPERT IN STRATEGIC URBAN PLANNING	25% of the time over 4 years	
WRI TECHNICAL EXPERT IN URBAN DATA GOVERNANCE	25% of the time over 4 years	
WRI TECHNICAL EXPERT IN URBAN RESILIENCE AND NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS	15% of the time over 2 years	
SCIP REGIONAL COORDINATOR FOR LATIN AMERICA	80% of the time over 5 years	X
SCIP COUNTRY COORDINATOR FOR INDONESIA	80% of the time over 5 years	X
C40 PROJECT DIRECTOR (CO-FINANCE)	15% of time over 5 years	
C40 SENIOR TECHNICAL ADVISOR	100% of the time over 5 years	X
C40 ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING OFFICER	100% of time over 5 years	X
C40 FINANCE EXPERTS (TEAM OF 6 PEOPLE)	30% of time over 4 ½ years	
C40 PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT OFFICER	100% of time over 4 ½ years	X
SCIP REGIONAL COORDINATOR FOR AFRICA	100% of the time over 4 ½ years	X
ICLEI PROJECT DIRECTOR	9% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI SENIOR TECHNICAL ADVISOR	42% of the time over 5 years	X
ICLEI TECHNICAL OFFICER 1 (WS)	56% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI TECHNICAL OFFICER 2 (WS)	53% of the time over 5 years	

ICLEI FINANCE & CONTROLLING EXPERT (WS)	5% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI EVENTS COORDINATOR (WS)	6% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST (WS)	6% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI RESEARCH SPECIALIST (WS)	32% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI KNOWLEDGE OFFICER (WS)	8% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI URBAN DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS: CIRCULAR ECONOMY, CLIMATE, ENERGY, FINANCE, MOBILITY, NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS, RESILIENCE (WS)	62% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI FINANCE SPECIALIST	16% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI ADVOCACY SPECIALIST	13% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI REGIONAL OFFICE EXPERTS	94% of the time over 5 years	
ICLEI SCIP REGIONAL/COUNTRY COORDINATOR IN INDIA	80% of the time over 5 years	X
ICLEI REGIONAL/COUNTRY COORDINATOR CHINA	80% of the time over 5 years	X
UNEP CITIES STRATEGIC LEAD (P5) (CO-FINANCE)	25% of the time over 5 years	
UNEP CITIES TECHNICAL LEAD (P4) (CO-FINANCE)	42% of the over 5 years	
UNEP CITIES PROJECT OFFICER - GLOBAL ADVOCACY (P3)	50% of the time for 2 years and 100% of the time for 3 years	X
UNEP TECHNICAL EXPERT(S)	Multiple experts – equivalent of 58% over 5 years	

This clarification has been added in Annex K.

22.6.20

Thanks for this. We have adjusted the roles of both the Steering Committee and the Executive Management Team according to your request. These changes are captured in the document in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section and in Annex H.

Regarding the change in coordinator's position for Indonesia, we have changed the document to reflect that ICLEI will now coordinate with cities in Indonesia through a country coordinator. The budget has been also adjusted to reflect this change.

---

[1] The 2M identified in our previous response is not overhead for organization, it includes all kinds of contracts that will be outsourced, mostly related to project's logistics and travel.

## **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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

Yes. The required details are provided.

#### **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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The indicators remain realistic.

The SCIP city engagement strategy indicates that the project will engage with GEF 6 IAP cities and other strategic non-SCIP cities in its capacity building

#### **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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The project justification is sound. It identifies root causes of environmental degradation in cities, key capacity, planning, financing and knowledge barriers which need to be removed to deliver transformational change. The proposal also duly factors in the current COVID-19 crisis and proposes risk mitigation measures and opportunities to support cities in green recovery.

**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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The baseline scenario is elaborated well. It includes details of initiatives by city networks, civil society, business associations and MDB/RDBs to promote urban sustainability. It also includes the ongoing GEF Sustainable Cities IAP and the GPSC as a foundation to build on in the GEF 7 phase through this global project.

**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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The alternative scenario is in consistent with the strategy outlined in the PFD and the global project concept note. The project description is adequate and includes sufficient details to visualize and build the theory of change of the project.

As noted earlier, please indicate if the stated outputs and deliverables include cities which are beyond the child projects participating in GEF 7.

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

Thanks. Comments cleared.

**Agency Response**

21.5.20

Please see the response to question 2 above. Additional cities beyond the immediate GEF 7 program cities are included, including GEF 6 cities and additional cities based, on congruences in interest, commitments, ability to participate and benefit from the program, and as project resources can allow.

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The project's alignment with Sustainable Cities Impact Program is elaborated well. The global project will advance integrated approaches to target systemic drivers of environmental degradation in cities. The clear focus on integrated urban planning, supporting cities directly in partnership with national governments and creating a platform for sharing knowledge and coordination, overall, is consistent with the IP strategy.

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The incremental reasoning is robust. The project builds on the baseline initiatives of cities globally and the co-financing from city networks, WRI and UNEP to propose value added perspectives of integrated urban planning, adopting innovative approaches to support evidence based planning and financing to scale up sustainability solutions in cities. There is strong emphasis on engaging private sector and adopting gender sensitive approaches in sustainable urban development solutions. The project proposes unique strategy to target multiple global environmental benefits related to climate change, biodiversity and avoided land degradation, along with climate resilience and inclusion benefits to support overall well being of citizens. In addition, the project will create and disseminate knowledge on emerging integrated approaches such as circular cities and nature based solutions in cities.

**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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

Yes. There is sufficient elaboration of GEBs and also adaptation benefits. The results framework provide sufficient information to indicate how GEBs and adaptation benefits will be achieved

**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**

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

Yes. The sustainability and innovation aspects are articulated well across the project components.

**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**

**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**

Yes, this is a child project and it reflects clearly how it will effectively contribute to the outcomes of the Sustainable Cities IP as outlined in the Program Framework Document.

**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**

Yes. Stakeholder engagement is done extensively during the project design phase. A detailed stakeholder engagement plan is also provided.

**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**

A detailed gender analysis is completed and a strategy is proposed to indicate how gender consideration will be made across each project components.

**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**

The private sector engagement strategy is robust. Relevant stakeholders have been identified at the design stage e.g. WBCSD. A comprehensive mapping of potential private sector partners and their respective engagements across the project components and outputs have been presented. Through the Partnership Engagement Group, the project design allows for systemic involvement of private sector and other stakeholders to influence and steer the project towards its desired goals.

**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**

Risks are elaborated well. The risk related to COVID-19 is also included. Mitigation strategies proposed are satisfactory.

### **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**

GEFSEC 20 May , 2020

The institutional arrangement is described in details and appears sound to deliver the project outcomes. The coordination of this project with the existing GEF 6 IAP's GPSC is also outlined well.

Please refer to the comments related to budget which is relevant for coordination also.

In the template, please add other Executing Agencies (ICLEI, C40 and UNEP) also. Currently it indicates only WRI.

GEFSEC 24 May, 2020

Thanks for the response. We understand that there was a issue in the portal to enter different categories for each executing partner. We will work with the GEF IT team to try to fix it. Please confirm if the below classification is appropriate:

WRI- CSO; C40: CSO; ICLEI: CSO; UN Environment: GEF Agency

GEFSEC 28 May, 2020

Comments cleared.

### **Agency Response**

21.5.20

The project budget has been unpacked and labelled to show more clearly what GEF funds will be buying. Please see the response to question 5 for more details on this question.

Regarding Executing Agencies entry in the portal, we can only select one category, so we have selected 'Others'. This now allows us to include WRI, ICLEI, C40, and UNEP Cities Unit.

26.5.20

Thank you. Yes, we confirm that the classification you indicate is adequate: WRI- CSO; C40: CSO; ICLEI: CSO; UN Environment GEF Agency.

### **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. The global project will align its activities with respective country child projects which are aligned with the national priorities related to climate change, biodiversity and land degradation. The project will directly engage with countries and link them with global climate, biodiversity and land degradation (avoidance) agreements. It is expected to support countries directly in meeting their climate commitments under NDCs and achieving SDGs. The project has a specific component to build sustainability leadership of cities and provide support to raise their climate and sustainability ambitions.

## **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**

Yes. Knowledge management is a distinct stated objective of the project as outlined in component 2. It is a fundamental aspect of the project which will drive capacity building, policy influencing and action on ground in cities. The approach proposed is comprehensive and robust.

## **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**

Yes.

## 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, the socio-economic benefits are sufficiently described. The integrated approach proposed will integrate multiple sectors and infrastructure in cities to provide cross cutting social, economic and environmental benefits and support improved livability in cities. The project proposes strong emphasis on gender, inclusion and local environmental challenges such as air and water pollution by targeting systemic urban challenges such as congestion and urban sprawl. In long term, these will be translated into GEBs through integrated planning and policy leadership on sustainability. The project also proposes to support cities in post COVID-19 economic recovery through access to relevant knowledge, tools and capacity building. With a focus on planning, catalyzing innovation and accessing finance, the project promises to guide cities towards a recovery based on sustainability and green principles.

## Agency Response

### Annexes

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

## Agency Response

### Project Results Framework

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project results framework is satisfactory.

The Safeguards risk included in the proposal is not sufficiently described. Please tailor the screening template to the project's design as much possible with a bit more details. Some of the risks have no relevance at all with this project e.g. safety of dams. The template included refers to GCF also which is not clear.

The recommendation also needs to be relevant to this project. It reads very generic.

GEFSEC May 24, 2020

Thanks. On page 244, the project title reads "Project preparation proposal for: Sustainable Cities Impact Program Global Platform". This indicates PPG. Please revise.

GEFSEC May 28, 2020

Comments cleared.

## Agency Response

21.5.2020.

The full and complete UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note has now been included in the submission. This has now been included as Annex P to the CEO Endorsement Document. Reference to the GCF has been removed from the Note.

26.5.20

The title in the ESERN has been amended as requested.

### GEF Secretariat comments



**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

The GEFSEC comments at the PFD stage have been addressed satisfactorily.

**Agency Response**

**Council comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Comments received from Council members have been responded satisfactorily.

**Agency Response**

**STAP comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

STAP comments have been addressed well.

**Agency Response**

**Convention Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response**

**Other Agencies comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response**

**CSOs comments**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response**

**Status of PPG utilization**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Status is provided. Due to COVID-19, the PPG could not be utilized fully. The funds will be used during initial implementation phase.

**Agency Response**

**Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response**

**Project maps and coordinates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes. The project's geo-referenced information is adequate.

**Agency Response**

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

## Agency Response

### **08.07.2020: UNEP RESPONSE COMMENTS FOR SECTION GEFSEC DECISION: RECOMMENDATION**

- Provide additional details explaining how the project will support indirect GHG emission reduction. **Resp: We have added more details on how the SCIP GP will lead to Global Environmental Benefits. We have updated the relevant sections: Explanation below *Table F – Project's target contribution to GEF 7 core Indicators, Section 6 Global Environmental Benefits* and especially *Annex M Estimates of core Indicators***

- Indicator 1.2 isn't directly relevant for the project as it will not support interventions directly in the protected areas. The agency is requested to consider indicator 4.1 for biodiversity related results. **Resp: We agree with the suggestion and we have done the modifications in the *Table F, Annex F GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet* and in *Annex M Estimates of core indicators*.**

- Please include the GHG emissions and BD indicator in the portal's results module. **Resp: All the indicators are in the proper section in the portal now.**

- Since IP Cities has its own envelope, this child project should be charged against the IP SC set-aside as indicated in the PFD and not against CC Global/Regional Set-aside. **Resp: We have amended the set-aside to IP SC, for this we have amended the focal area from Climate Change to Multi-focal area and thus we have changed accordingly table D of the CEO Endorsement so it is aligned with the portal now.**

## EFSEC DECISION

## RECOMMENDATION

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 20 May 2020

The agency is requested to address the comments and resubmit the endorsement request.

GEFSEC 24 May 2020

The agency is requested to address the comments and resubmit the endorsement request.

GEFSEC 28 May, 2020

The agency is requested to address one outstanding comment and resubmit the ER.

GEFSEC 9 June 2020

Please address the additional comment related to budget and resource allocation and resubmit the endorsement request.

GEFSEC 19 June 2020

Please address the outstanding comments in section 5 under GEF Resource Availability and resubmit the CEO endorsement request.

GEFSEC 25 June 2020

All the comments have been addressed and therefore CEO Endorsement is recommended.

GEFSEC July 2, 2020

Please address additional comments as below:

- Provide additional details explaining how the project will support indirect GHG emission reduction.
- Indicator 1.2 isn't directly relevant for the project as it will not support interventions directly in the protected areas. The agency is requested to consider indicator 4.1 for biodiversity related results.
- Please include the GHG emissions and BD indicator in the portal's results module.
- Since IP Cities has its own envelope, this child project should be charged against the IP SC set-aside as indicated in the PFD and not against CC Global/Regional Set-aside.

GEFSEC July 9 2020

CEO endorsement is recommended as it has addressed outstanding comments satisfactorily.

## **Review Dates**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement    Response to Secretariat comments

First Review	5/20/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/24/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/28/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/9/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/19/2020

### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The design of the SCIP- Global Project is well aligned with the PFD approved by the GEF Council in December 2019. In line with the GEF 7 programming strategy, the proposed approach focuses on making cities central to promoting transformational change targeting systemic drivers of environmental degradation. In this regard, the project design has three key elements:

- Direct support to cities for integrated urban planning and investing in innovative sustainability solutions.
- Create and disseminate cutting edge knowledge and resources to support integrated urban planning.
- Build partnerships between cities, private sector and other urban actors for innovation, scale, sustainability and global advocacy.

The elements are embedded across the four components through the project will be delivered: policy and evidence-based planning, sustainability investments, knowledge and learning, and partnership and advocacy. These components are underpinned by a robust theory of change, linking project outputs and outcomes, with GEBs related to climate change, biodiversity and avoided land degradation. The project is effectively designed to provide value added support to nine country child projects and 24 cities, with direct links to the GEF-6 SC-IAP program and other globally important cities. It aims to provide global leadership on urban sustainability by creating cutting edge knowledge, facilitating exchange of ideas, building capacities and forging new partnerships. A separate component focused on effective management and coordination will ensure that the overall SCIP portfolio delivers GEBs in a coherent manner, while at the same time influencing outcomes beyond just those of individual projects. With technical assistance offered across local, national and global levels, the project will support cities towards accelerated climate ambition, stronger multi-level government coordination, improved institutional

capacity for integrated planning and enhanced access to global city networks and conventions.

The project will engage with a broad range of partners in private sector, financial sector, city networks and civil society to leverage their influence and resources for global outreach and project sustainability. It will do so through regional forums, city academies and innovation labs for cities and also through dedicated partnerships. A Partnership Engagement Group will create space for engaging with partners and experts to secure inputs on emerging opportunities and directions. In addition to leveraging city networks and partnerships of C40 and ICLEI, the project has identified strategic partners including the regional development banks EBRD, IADB and AfDB and project preparation facilities such as CCFLA and FELICITY (EIB). It will also collaborate with private sector with a goal of engaging them not only as solution providers but also as co-creators of solutions that improve wellbeing of citizens, protect the environment and increase private shareholder value. Through direct engagement with private sector networks, accelerator platforms, urban planners and infrastructure developers such as WBCSD, District Energy in Cities Initiative of UNEP, AECOM, Cardno, Arup and COWI to develop cutting edge urban planning and sustainability solutions. The project will build on the work of City-Business Climate Alliance (CBCA) which is a joint initiative of C40 Cities, WBCSD and CDP to ensure city mayors and business CEOs can translate their global climate commitments into practical actions.

The project will generate valuable knowledge on urban sustainability. In addition to the focus on integrated urban planning it will aim to advance global knowledge on cross cutting and emerging sustainability approaches such as circular economy, nature-based solutions, data governance, climate action planning focusing on resilience, mitigation and neighborhood planning targeting infrastructure interconnectivity. The knowledge generation and dissemination will be based on key drivers of environmental degradation such as urban sprawl, congestion and inequality. As the COVID-19 pandemic will define the near future's urban growth, the global platform will engage with strategic partners to develop cross cutting knowledge that strengthens cities' resilience to health emergencies and support an economic recovery which is green. For effective sharing and dissemination of knowledge, the GP will create a library of knowledge and utilize a mix of webinars, workshops and peer exchange sessions to share the knowledge and experiences globally. The project will engage with global urban forums and environment conventions to advocate integrated urban planning and urban sustainability.

The global project design places a strong emphasis on adopting gender responsive approaches in integrated land use planning, infrastructure design and investment decision making to ensure that sustainable development outcomes are equitable for both men and women. It will support child projects in integrating gender in their project design and collecting relevant sex-disaggregated data and evidence to influence policy, planning and decision making in cities. To ensure adoption and wide scale replication of these approaches, the project will proactively engage with women leaders and urban practitioners globally and provide them a stronger voice in global forums and decision making related to urban sustainability.

The project's implementation structure aligns with the central approach of putting city-based organizations at the forefront of project execution. The global project's execution will be led by WRI in partnership with ICLEI and C40 with UNEP as the lead GEF agency. UNEP's cities unit will also work as an executing agency especially for linking the global platform with UN conventions and forums related to cities and environment. The overall framework for governance includes four parts: a) a high level panel of experts to provide steer, b) a Steering Committee to oversee the SCIP program delivery by reviewing the global project's budget, work plans and coordination with country projects, c) an Executive Management Team to manage the day-to-day operations, and d) the Partnership Engagement Group to link the program with key actors and initiatives for effective delivery. The budget makes provision for engagement with other strategic delivery partners depending on the changing urban dynamics due to factors such as COVID-19. Such opportunities will be assessed and decided by

partners depending on the changing urban dynamics due to factors such as COVID-19. Such opportunities will be assessed and decided by the Steering Committee and implemented by the Executive Management team.

The project draws on the lessons learned from the GEF 6 IAP program and will build on its Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC), which has generated a wealth of data, knowledge and experience. The SCIP will collaborate and work with the GPSC going forward by coordinating on planned trainings and events to avoid duplication and seek synergies, bringing the resources and lessons learned by the GPSC into the GEF 7 project, inviting GEF-6 cities to SCIP forums and trainings and linking the new SCIP-GP website to the GPSC website based on an agreed strategy.

The support offered through the global project ranges from supporting cities make high level political commitments on sustainability to hand holding them to prepare integrated urban plans and access funds for their priorities. Such wide range of support will enhance acceptance and visibility and thereby influence action at all levels. The integrated approach is reinforced well with innovation and inclusion aspects in the project design with clearly defined activities targeting low/zero carbon, climate resilient and inclusive cities. Cross cutting and emerging integrated approaches supported through the project, such as circular economy for cities and nature-based solutions, will be catalytic in transforming the way cities are planned. Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic is given due consideration in the project design. The global project will build on existing efforts of cities to support green economic recovery.