



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5372		
Country/Region:	Belarus		
Project Title:	Belarus Green Cities: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium Sized Cities in Belarus		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4981 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$80,000	Project Grant:	\$3,091,000
Co-financing:	\$10,150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,321,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	John O'Brien

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	DER, April 5, 2013. Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	DER, April 5, 2013. Yes. Mr. Kulik endorsed the project on March 21, 2013 for \$3,622,260 inclusive of PPG and fee.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	DER, April 5, 2013. No. Due to the pending approval of the SGP program, which includes a \$1,799,999 contribution from the CCM focal area, the remaining STAR allocation and CCM allocation is a grand-total of \$3,512,621. Therefore, there are insufficient funds to fulfill the	

		<p>project amount, PPG amount and agency fee as appropriate to fit within the remaining envelope. As the letter of endorsement is for a value greater than available, it will not have to be re-issued.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2013. The revised PIF adjusts for the amount remaining. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. No. Due to the pending approval of the SGP program, which includes a \$1,799,999 contribution from the CCM focal area, the remaining STAR allocation and CCM allocation is a grand-total of \$3,512,621. Therefore, there are insufficient funds to fulfill the PIF as submitted. Please adjust the PIF project amount, PPG amount and agency fee as appropriate to fit within the remaining envelope.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2013. The revised PIF adjusts for the amount remaining. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. NA</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. NA</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. NA</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. NA</p>	
<p><b>Strategic Alignment</b></p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?  <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART</i></p>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. Table A is properly filled out using CCM-2 and CCM-4. However, we do not see sufficient reference in the project components to CCM-2 benefits. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2013. The revised PIF clarifies the CCM-2 objectives. Comment cleared.</p>	

	<i>used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	DER, April 5, 2013. Yes.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>DER, April 5, 2013.</p> <p>a) We understand the baseline and lack of urban planning in Belarus. However, we don't understand the incremental nature of the GEF project relative to the EU Green Economy effort. Please clarify.</p> <p>b) Regarding the baseline/BAU GHG emissions, there needs to be much more clarification on the specific baseline against which the proposed activities will have an impact.</p> <p>DER, April 12, 2013.</p> <p>a) The revised PIF clarifies the EU Green Economy focus baseline activities and the incremental benefits of the GEF project. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The revised PIF clarifies the incremental activities relative to the baseline. Comment cleared.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. The project is composed of the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green Urban Development Plans</li> <li>2. Demonstration Projects on Transport (Novopolotsk/Polotsk)</li> <li>3. Demonstration Projects on EE lighting (Novogrudok)</li> <li>4. Green Cities Association of Belarus</li> </ol> <p>Please address the following comments:</p>	

a) The Table B can be simplified greatly by not repeating all specific plans under preparation. But we would like clarification on if the plans listed are the entirety of all planning. In other words, will the planning processes be sustainable after the project is completed? Please clarify.

b) Look for streamlining in this activity as the three city planning efforts will have many similar elements. Allocate savings to other components. Please clarify.

#### Component 2

c) Please delineate the TA and INV activities on separate rows, showing the GEF funding and co-financing. We count feasibility studies and campaigns as TA.

d) What kind of INV is included? Will the GEF funding be used as grant?

e) We are concerned that demonstration projects may be insufficient to ensure sustainable outcomes. We would like to see provision for policies that would ensure sustainable green urban transport after the project is over. Please justify how the demonstration projects lead to sustainability.

#### Component 3

e) Please delineate the TA and INV activities on separate rows, showing the GEF funding and co-financing.

f) For street lighting, please refer to UNDP project in Armenia for suggested approaches for developing sustainable policies to ensure that street lighting programs have funding after the project is complete. For example, provided a revolving loan fund that is paid back

- lighting.
- g) the replication plan is welcome. Please clarify if policies and regulations are in the baseline or will need to be part of the GEF project.
  - h) Please explain in addition a replication and funding strategy for SWH replacement as mentioned on page 9.

Component 4

- i) These activities appear to duplicate component 1. Please clarify. If this component replicates the project in 5 additional cities, then we do not see how the planning activities are sustainable after the project is over. Please consider project designs that enable follow-on planning in other cities through sustainable platforms.
- j) Involvement of City Associations is quite valuable. Please clarify if any GEF funding will be used by the associations and for which activity.

DER, April 12, 2013.

- a) The response documents the capacity building for planning will be retained in specific agencies. Comment cleared.
- b) The response describes streamlining and adjusts funding. Comment cleared.
- c) Delineated as requested. Comment cleared.
- d) Comment cleared.
- e) The response describes the replicability. Regulatory and policy options will be explored in PPG phase. Comment cleared.
- f) Response explains the Belarus government model and how the grant approach will be best. Comment cleared.
- g) Regulatory and policy options will be

		<p>cleared.</p> <p>h) SWH moved to baseline and not part of the GEF project. Comment cleared.</p> <p>i) Revised PIF clarifies no duplication and describes replicability. Comment cleared.</p> <p>j) Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. No. The estimate of GHG benefits must come from bottom up analysis of the potential GHG reductions from project activities: urban planning, transport, and efficiency. A top-down analysis would only be appropriate if it was restricted to specific sectors to be impacted by the project activities. We do not understand how the emissions reduction of the petrochemical refinery can be included. The estimate requires a major rework.</p> <p>DER, April 10, 2013. Estimate adjusted. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. Yes.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate</p>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. Please describe the risk that sustainable funding for urban planning may not be available.</p> <p>DER, April 10, 2013. Comment cleared.</p>	

	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013. Thank you for the documentation.  a) Please explain how the GEF project will not duplicate the EU Green Economy initiative emphasis on urban planning in the cities.  b) There is very substantial Belarus CCM contribution to the SGP program. Please document how coordination with the SGP will avoid duplication for CCM related activities.</p> <p>DER, April 10, 2013.  a) Clarification provided. Comment cleared.  b) Clarification on the lack of overlap provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>DER, April 5, 2013.  a) We support the idea for integrated urban planning. We do not yet see in the writeup how energy efficiency is included.  b) This project would be more innovative and replicable if sustainable funding for urban planning and regulatory policies were included.</p> <p>DER, April 10, 2013.  a) Efficiency explained. Comment cleared.  b) Plans for replication provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project</p>		

	approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DER, April 5, 2013. See comments in box 7.  DER, April 10, 2013. Comment cleared.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	DER, April 5, 2013. The amount claimed for EU Green Economy Project may mix baseline co-financing and project co-financing. Please clarify. The amount UNDP is bringing is adequate.  DER, April 10, 2013. Clarification provided. Comment cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	DER, April 5, 2013. Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	DER, April 5, 2013. Yes, the PPG is requested at \$80,000 which is within the upper limit recommend.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	DER, April 5, 2013. No, however, please consider the use of a non-grant instrument for the GEF INV portion to promote sustainable funding.  DER, April 10, 2013. Explanation provided. Comment cleared.	
Project Monitoring	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with		



	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	DER, April 5, 2013. Not yet. Please address comments in boxes: 3, 4,6,7,8,11,12,13,16,17,19.  DER, April 10, 2013. All comments cleared. This project is technically cleared and can be considered in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DER, April 10, 2013. Please study policy and regulatory options during the PPG phase that would support sustainable urban planning, street lighting, transport, and efficiency efforts.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 05, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**