GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9107**		
Country/Region:	**Sri Lanka**		
Project Title:	**Resilient and Integrated Urban Development for Greater Colombo**		
GEF Agency:	**ADB**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$91,324**	Project Grant:	**$4,109,589**
Co-financing:	**$128,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$132,200,913**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Rawleston Moore**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mingyuan Fan**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	FI, 3/27/15: Further information is requested. According to Table A, the project is aligned with SCCF strategic objective CCA-1 (reducing the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change). Since the project will also be supporting the mainstreaming of climate risk considerations in policies and frameworks, and the establishment of sectoral coordinating mechanisms, it also seems to be aligned with CCA-3 (integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes).

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Recommended action: Kindly select all relevant CCA objectives for the project. Update, FI, 3/31/15: Yes, the project is aligned with CCA objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. It is aligned with several strategic thrusts of Sri Lanka's 'National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy' (NCCAS; 2011-16), e.g., 'enabling climate-resilient and healthy settlements', and 'safeguarding natural resources and biodiversity from climate change impacts'. The project is also in alignment with Sri Lanka's NAP process. It will draw on emerging lessons from other GEF and other-agency funded projects on adaptation and urban development in Sri Lanka, and will coordinate with ICLEI, C40 and other initiatives on knowledge management activities.
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	FI, 3/27/15: Information is requested. The Agency is requested to comment on the project's potential for scale-up, innovation and sustainability. Update, FI, 3/31/15: Yes for PIF stage. By CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on: a) aspects of the project that could be scaled up or replicated; b) how the project has sought to explore innovative approaches to EbA and its integration in urban planning

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		in Colombo, and; c) likelihood of sustainability of the policy and investment measures that will be undertaken.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. The PIF places consistent emphasis on addressing the additional risks posed by climate change to existing stresses faced to water and wastewater management in Colombo. (However, see comment for item 5, below, which requests additional information on planned adaptation investments in sub-comment (2).
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	FI, 3/27/15: Adjustment and further information is requested: 1) It is noted that risks will be discussed in detailed at the CEO endorsement stage. However, please discuss at concept stage the risks pertaining to project feasibility vis a vis the current political situation. (Will the requisite enabling conditions be available to support the high degree of inter-sectoral coordination required for 'resilient and integrated urban development in Greater Colombo', as per the project title?) 2) Please provide more information on the demo adaptation activities mentioned under Thrust C. 3) Outcome 1.1 in Table states that CCA will be "mainstreamed into policies and frameworks for sustainable urban planning and management"; however, the PIF does not identify any urban development plans or strategies into which CCA should be mainstreamed. 4) Component 2, on assessing and prioritizing EBA options, seems expensive at >$500,000. Recommended actions: 1) Please discuss whether the political situation could

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		thwart successful achievement of inter-sectoral collaboration, which is presumably needed for the project. 2) Please provide a brief indication of what some types of demo project activities of Thrust C might be; specifically (i) how many direct beneficiaries are expected from these investments; and (ii) how these investments are likely to differ from regular (business as usual) ecosystem restoration, water and flood management projects to include consideration of the risks posed by climate change. 3) Please identify some urban policies or strategies that could benefit from integration of CCA considerations through the SCCF project. 4) Please provide some explanation of why assessment and prioritization of EBA options (Component 2) would be so financially intensive? Update, FI, 3/31/15: Yes. Adequate information has been provided by the Agency for PIF stage. Political circumstances are not expected to impede effective project execution; indicative information on the EbA investments has been provided; and key policies/plans have been identified within which CCA considerations will be mainstreamed. By CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on the project's geographic scope within Colombo, and the adaptation investments that will be undertaken, with additionality reasoning provided.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes for PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		By CEO endorsement: Please provide further details.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• The STAR allocation?	
	• The focal area allocation?	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes.
	• Focal area set-aside?	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	FI, 3/27/15: Not yet. Please address comments for items 1, 3 and 5. Also, a letter of endorsement from the OFP for Sri Lanka has yet to be received. We would welcome engagement with the Agency during project design should the PIF be cleared for WP entry. Update, FI, 3/31/15: Yes, pending receipt of OFP endorsement letter. Update, FI, 4/1/15: Yes. A letter of endorsement from the OFP has been received. While it specifies a lower funding request than the PIF, this will not be an issue given that the SCCF is not associated with a STAR allocation or country ceiling. By CEO Endorsement: Please see comments for items 3, 5 and 6.
Review Date	Review	March 27, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.