



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

GEF ID:	4949		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Low-Carbon Urban Mobility for Large Cities		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-4; CCM-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,000,000
Co-financing:	\$77,170,000	Total Project Cost:	\$83,170,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Vera Lucia Vicentini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, April 9, 2012: No. Please submit a letter from the operational focal point from Brazil. HT, September 6, 2012: Yes, an endorsement letter was signed by Mr Rodrigo Vieira in the amount of \$6,710,000.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	HT, April 9, 2012: There is no non-grant instrument.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes, the proposed grant is within the STAR allocation.	
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes, the proposed grant is within the CC mitigation focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes, it is aligned with CCM-4, especially transport demand management and non-motorized transport.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes, the objective of CCM-4 (Promote energy efficient, low-carbon transport and urban systems) is identified.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes, online platform to share best practices and lessons learned will be	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of project outcomes?	<p>established.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012: Yes. While the revised document has removed the online platform activity, other activities in Component 3 will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>HT, April 9, 2012: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) The PIF explains PAC projects will investment \$ 10 billion in the 24 large cities (page 6). What part of the PAC projects is defined as the baseline projects in this proposal? Are the PAC projects in the targeted four cities defined as the baseline projects? Please be more specific.</p> <p>b) The PIF explains PAC projects are lacking when it comes to integrating sustainable transport and climate change issues (page 6). On the other hand, PAC projects include infrastructure investments in sustainable transportation such as BRT/ bus corridors, light rail and monorail (page 9). To what extent would PAC projects accomplish in context of sustainable transport? What value would the GEF financing add? Please clarify.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012: a) The revised PIF has explained that PAC projects in the four pilot cities are defined as the baseline projects. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) GEF intervention to overcome the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		limitation of the PAC projects has been explained. Comment cleared.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>HT, April 9, 2012: This will be examined again after receiving responses to the comments for other items.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012: Yes. The proposed activities using GEF funding are based on incremental cost reasoning. Comment cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>HT, April 9, 2012: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) In Table B, numbering of the expected outcomes and outputs (ex. Outcome 1.1, Output 2.1) would be helpful.</p> <p>Component 1: b) Since the Ministry of Cities is the executing agency of this project, it is not appropriate to include an activity to develop the capacity of the Ministry. Please revise.</p> <p>Component 2: c) Transport planning is categorized into Technical Assistance. If it is not directly related to investment in the targeted cities, please separate it as another component for Technical</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Assistance.</p> <p>d) In B.2, Please clarify what kind of investment (e.g. integration of bicycle paths, pedestrian sidewalks, BRT stations, bicycle parking and public space) will be delivered in each Cities group.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>e) Please include activities to disseminate the outputs of Component 1 and 2.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012:</p> <p>a) Numbering has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The activity of capacity-building has been revised. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Please separate Component 2 to two components (one is for TA; the other is for Investment.) Please show the amount of GEF grant and amount of co-financing for TA and INV separately.</p> <p>d) The contents of the investment have been explained. Comment cleared. They should be elaborated by the CEO endorsement stage if the PIF is cleared.</p> <p>e) The activities to disseminate the outputs of Component 1 and 2 have been included. Comment cleared.</p> <p>HT, September 11, 2012:</p> <p>c) Explanation for difficulty to separate the funding has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes, the methodology and assumptions apply the GEF/STAP manual for calculating GHG benefits of GEF Transportation Projects.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, 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?	HT, April 9, 2012: Please add gender dimensions as the socio-economic benefits. HT, September 6, 2012: Gender dimensions have been added. Comment cleared.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, April 9, 2012: Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	HT, April 9, 2012: Will the Project management Unit (PMU) be established in the Ministry of Cities (MoC)? What about the relationship between PMU and MoC? Please clarify. HT, September 6, 2012: Please address the comment on April 9. HT, September 11, 2012: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>HT, April 9, 2012: The percentage of the Project Management Cost (PMC) before PMC is 5% (= 600,000/12,000,000), which is acceptable. However, the ratio of GEF PMC to total PMC should be the same as the ratio of the GEF project grant to total project cost. The PMC of co-financing is too low compared to the total co-financing. Please revise.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012: The ratio of GEF PMC to total PMC has been improved. Comment cleared.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>HT, April 9, 2012: Please address the following comments: a) As to Component 2, four cities to demonstrate pilot projects will be selected during the project preparation phase. Does this mean the co-financing amount will vary, depending on the selected cities? Please clarify. b) As to Component 3 (capacity building and dissemination), the ratio of the GEF funding is too high. Given the nature of the project, please reduce the GEF portion so that the ratio of the GEF funding in the component is similar to the ratio of the GEF project grant to total project cost.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>HT, September 6, 2012:</p> <p>a) The status of co-financing has been explained. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) In Component 3, the ratio of the GEF funding has been reduced. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>HT, April 9, 2012:</p> <p>Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) The current co-financing ratio is 1 to 4.4. Please consider to increase the ratio by identifying additional co-financing.</p> <p>b) The PIF describes PAC Mobilidade Grandes Cidades will invest US\$10 billion in the 24 largest cities in the country (page 6). This description leads to investment of \$416 million per city on average. Please explain the implication of this amount in context of co-financing, given the concept that the proposal targets four PAC cities.</p> <p>c) As one of the co-financing sources, the PIF lists up the hard loan of the Government of Brazil (\$30 million). Is this a policy-based loan? In the GEF terminology, government resources do not include loans or credits which are recorded under the relevant agency. Please clarify it.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012:</p> <p>a) The current co-financing ratio has been increased. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Please address the comment on April 9.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		HT, September 11, 2012: c) Explanation on the government loan has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	HT, April 9, 2012: Please address the following comments: a) The IDB currently has loans in sustainable transport in the PAC cities (Loans in preparation: \$182 million, Loans in supervision: \$176 million). How is this amount related to co-financing of this project? Please explain. b) The PIF explains the co-financing from the IDB is \$50 million (page 14). This is inconsistent with the Table C (total of IDB co-financing: \$22 million). Please clarify. HT, September 6, 2012: a) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. b) Inconsistency has been corrected. Comment cleared.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>HT, April 9, 2012: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments. In particular, please submit an endorsement letter as soon as possible.</p> <p>HT, September 6, 2012: Please address the comments in box 14 c), 20, and 25 c). Also, a revised PIF should be signed by the Agency Coordinator.</p> <p>HT, September 11, 2012: The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>HT, September 11, 2012: Please address the following items at the CEO Endorsement stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Detailed descriptions of the baseline project; b) Identification of targeted cities and the rationale; c) Concrete plan of the investment component (bicycle path); and d) Detailed description of the executing arrangement, especially communication between the Ministry of Cities and the IEMA. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 09, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 11, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	HT, September 6, 2012: Please include an activity to elaborate on the invest component, that is bicycle paths as showcase of low carbon transport network. HT, September 11, 2012: Selection and feasibility assessment of bicycle infrastructure have been added. Comment cleared.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	HT, September 6, 2012: In Component 2, the definition of baseline should be funded by co-financing. Please clarify it. HT, September 11, 2012: It has been clarified that the definition of baseline will be covered by co-financing. Comment cleared.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	HT, April 9, 2012: PPG will not be recommended before PIF recommendation. HT, September 6, 2012: Please address the above comments. HT, September 11, 2012: All comments cleared. PPG will be recommended after the PIF is included in a Work Program.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 09, 2012
	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.