



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

GEF ID:	9368		
Country/Region:	Bangladesh		
Project Title:	Promoting Low Carbon Urban Development in Bangladesh		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5571 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,767,810
Co-financing:	\$24,255,800	Total Project Cost:	\$28,023,610
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Xiaomei Tan	Agency Contact Person:	Butchaiah Gadde

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: 1. Please highlight the linkage of this proposed project with the Bangladesh INDC. XT, March 24, 2016: Comment cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: 1. Please summarize the drivers	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>of urbanization in Bangladesh.</p> <p>2. Please analyze the root causes of the emerging urban issues in Bangladesh. The six issues listed in section 1.1. are symptoms not root causes.</p> <p>3. The innovative nature of this proposed project is yet to be fleshed out. Current description in section 1.6. does not suggest innovation.</p> <p>4. The sustainability of this project is questionable. There is no logic behind the statement, "SREDA being the nodal agency of the GoB under the MoPEMR, it will ensure long-term sustainability of the project."</p> <p>5. The description in section 1.6. does not suggest that the project has potential for scaling up. Many of the statements, such as "there exists a large potential for energy efficiency in building, as this has not been addressed so far in any of the baseline projects in the country," don't justify scaling up nature.</p> <p>XT, March 24, 2016:</p> <p>1) Thank you summarizing the drivers of urbanization in Bangladesh. On the driver of "conversion of rural growth centers into urban area," has</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the project taken this factor into consideration and design interventions to help convert these centers into low-carbon centers? If not, please explain why.</p> <p>2) The explanation on the six symptoms is helpful. However, the PIF never explain what IRRC is although it is used to explain how the project can be innovative.</p> <p>3) Without an explanation of IRRC, the innovative nature of the project is not justified.</p> <p>4) Any projects' success rely on a number of factors. Institutional capacity is only one of them. Please explain what other factors can ensure the sustainability of this project.</p> <p>5) Comment cleared.</p> <p>XT, April 15, 2016: All comments cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>XT, Jan. 21, 2016: Please explain if the CO2 reduction benefits in section 1.5. result from GEF investment exclusively.</p> <p>XT, March 24, 2016: At the CEO endorsement stage, please provide CO2 reduction benefits that result from GEF investment exclusively. Comment cleared.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound	XT, Jan. 21, 2016:	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Component 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban planning, municipal services provision and maintenance are primarily the responsibilities of Ministry of Local Government. Please explain how city-level integration of low carbon urban development plans (component 1) can be accomplished by working with MoPEMR. 2. World Bank, ADB and other bi-lateral development agencies have identified and invested in many urban development projects in Bangladesh in the past decades. Please justify the need for output 1.1 (identified cost effective waste-to-energy, energy efficiency and renewable energy interventions -----). 3. Where will the proposed coordination committee sit in the government structure? The Dhaka Municipal Corporation (DMC) and Chittagon Municipal Corporation (CMC), for example, are organized into five principal areas of responsibility and they all report to the CEO. In this case, the CEO works as a coordination committee. Please explain the relationship between the proposed committee and the CEO. 4. Please list the strategies and technologies that are to be incorporated into the City Corporation plans. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 2:</p> <p>5. Please explain the connection between four outputs and one outcome. It is not clear how implemented LED lighting and others will lead to "increased investments in EE and RE projects in cities"</p> <p>6. There are significant discrepancies with regards to outputs between table B and description on page 9. Please clearly describe the outputs of component 2 in terms of the number of LED lights installed, the installed capacity of waste-to-energy plants, and the amount of private investment leveraged.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>7. A significant portion of urban population in Bangladesh does not have access to basic municipal services, such as solid waste collection and water-borne sewerage service. Please explain what kind of "awareness raising" the project aims to achieve. Further, please justify GEF grant amount of "\$719,390" for this.</p> <p>8. Related to comment 7, the four proposed outputs are not justified.</p> <p>XT, March 24, 2016:</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please clearly articulate the agencies that will be included in the coordination committee. 2) Comment cleared. 3) The explanation in the matrix is helpful, but the write up is not reflected in the updated PIF document. 4) The explanation seems to be contradictory to Component 2, demonstration of "technologies such as biomethanation and 4R," which suggests that the project has already identified some relevant technologies and strategies. 5) The explanation in the matrix is helpful, but it is not added to the PIF document. 6) Please add the estimate of LED lamps and relevant info to the PIF document. 7) The response didn't address the question of "what kind of awareness raising the project aims to achieve." Please note that GEF's mandate is to advance global environmental benefits and the investment of \$719,390 needs to be justified. 8) Component 3 needs to be re-designed to justify the \$719,390. Alternative, the funding can be allocated to component 2, so more technologies can be deployed. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		XT, April 15, 2016: All comments are cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: No	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	XT, Jan. 21, 2016: No. The project is not encouraged if without major modification and justification. XT, March 24, 2016: No. The project is not ready. XT, April 16, 2016: Yes.	
Review Date	Review	January 21, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 24, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
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.