



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

GEF ID:	5650		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Promotion of Clean and Green Cities in China Through International Cooperation		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	147087 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$7,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Xiaomei Tan	Agency Contact Person:	Jiang Ru

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 ?	XT, December 9, 2013. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	XT, December 9, 2013. Yes. Endorsement letter from Ye Jiandi is eligible.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	XT, December 9, 2013. Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	XT, December 9, 2013. Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	XT, December 9, 2013. NA.	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	XT, December 9, 2013. NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	XT, December 9, 2013. NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	XT, December 9, 2013. NA.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013. Please consider adding CCM-4 as a focal area as well.</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014. The explanation is helpful. Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013. Yes.</p> <p>The project supports the climate change objectives set by China's 12th Five Year Plan. It also complements a number of national initiatives such as eco-city, low-carbon city, and forest city initiatives.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>The baseline project needs to be further defined. The background intro could benefit from adding the following info:</p> <p>a) Where does China currently stand in terms of international cooperation in the space of urbanization?</p> <p>b) What tools and methodologies are currently available for Chinese cities to conduct urban planning and calculate CO2 emissions?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>XT, February 3, 2014.</p> <p>Baseline scenario is clearly defined.</p> <p>a) The information on China's existing cooperation with OECD countries in climate change and sustainable urbanization is helpful.</p> <p>b) The actions by 31 Chinese provinces in compiling GHG inventories and the methodologies they adopted provided a good background.</p> <p>Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>Please clarify some specific issues in each of the components.</p> <p>Component 1: What added values the proposed studies will bring? In fact, a number of studies have been conducted with regards to green transport, energy efficiency, eco-cities, etc. in China.</p> <p>Component 2: How to ensure those planning and assessment tools will be adopted by cities?</p> <p>Component 4: What are the best mechanisms to promote south-south cooperation? Are seminars and workshops, as suggested by the PIF, sufficient? In addition to these, can the project leverage some existing international platforms, such as BRICs Climate Change Ministerial Dialogues, UNFCCC negotiations, and China-Africa</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Cooperation Forum?</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014.</p> <p>Component 1: The added values could be further strengthened at the CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Component 2: NDRC's policymaking and implementation authority is highlighted.</p> <p>Component 4: Further investigation of South-South cooperation mechanisms is promised.</p> <p>Comments 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>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>The incremental reasoning could be strengthened, as detailed in box 7.</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014.</p> <p>Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. 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?</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>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>Please include public participation dimension in the proposal.</p> <p>XT, February 4, 2014.</p> <p>The development of planning tools will</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		involve public participation. Comments cleared.	
	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 resilience)	XT, December 9, 2013. Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	XT, December 9, 2013. Yes. The World Bank has conducted many climate change related projects in China. Please summarize key lessons learned from previous and existing projects and explain how to reflect those lessons into the current proposal. XT, February 3, 2014. Main projects and their key points are added. Comments cleared.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. 	XT, December 9, 2013. The project needs to strengthen its innovative aspects, sustainability and potential for scaling up. Specifically, please clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How the 4 studies on the main policy and program contribute to China's institutional setup and policy making with regards to sustainable urbanization? b) How the typology study contributes to more targeted and effective policymaking? 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>c) How the proposed dialogues and seminars lead to scaling up of sustainable urbanization in developing countries?</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014.</p> <p>a) Explanation is provided. b) The typology study leads to a coherent and fixed set of menu options, which can be translated into policies. c) Through fostering mutual learning and cooperation, the proposed dialogues and seminars can lead to scaling up.</p> <p>Comments cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative 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?	<p>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>The question will be answered after reviewing the responses to comments above.</p> <p>XT, February 4, 2014. Yes. The GEF funding and co-financing are appropriate and adequate.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing	XT, December 9, 2013.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Please clarify: a) What kind of in-kind support NDRC is going to provide? b) Why the total co-funding is only devoted to component 4?</p> <p>Please consider adding World Bank contribution. If the WB contribution is not envisaged in this project, please explain how this project will lead to future WB financing.</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014. a) CEO endorsement stage will provide the co-financing info. b) China has set aside specific fund for annual South-South Cooperation projects on climate change, which is the goal of component 4. NDRC's in-kind supports include personnel salary, office space, travels, etc.</p> <p>Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>It seems unrealistic that the proposal does not count Project Management Cost. How will the project cover the cost for procurement plans, monitoring and evaluation etc?</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014. US\$100,000 from the grant funds will be allocated to PMC. Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency</p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013. No.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013. NA.</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>			
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>XT, December 9, 2013.</p> <p>Please let us know whether you would like to go through a one- or two-step approval process. We are available to discuss further.</p> <p>XT, February 3, 2014. Recommend for CEO PIF approval.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>XT, February 3, 2014.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please address the following items by the CEO approval stage:</p> <p>a) A clear strategy for promotion of clean and green cities in China after this project;</p> <p>b) Mechanisms to promote south-south cooperation in this field;</p> <p>c) Details of added values based on experience and lessons of relevant WB engagement;</p> <p>d) Robust co-financing, including the WB contribution;</p> <p>e) Co-financing of Project Management Cost;</p> <p>f) Estimation of GHG emissions avoided once the cities adopt the tools and policies.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	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.**