



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

GEF ID:	9682		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Achieving Efficient and Green Freight Transport Development in China		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	159883 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$15,596,000
Co-financing:	\$155,420,000	Total Project Cost:	\$171,016,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Xiaomei Tan	Agency Contact Person:	

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, Nov. 23, 2016: Yes. The project is in line with GEF-6, CCM-1, Program-1 Promote the timely development, demonstration, and financing of low-carbon technologies and mitigation options.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	XT, Nov. 23, 2016: Yes. From the sectoral perspective, the project will directly contribute to China's Mid- to Long-Term Logistics Development Plan (2014-2020). At the national level, the project will lay a foundation for China's "One Belt One Road" and "Yantze River Economic Belt" strategies. At the international level, the project will contribute to Paris Agreement through	

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
		supporting China's ambitious INDC targets.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>XT, Nov. 23, 2016: No. There is no description of the drivers of global environmental degradation from the logistics and freight perspective.</p> <p>XT, March 17, 2017: Comment cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	XT, Nov. 23, 2016: Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>XT, Nov. 23, 2016:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>1) In your design of national level TA and policy development, please consider market based approaches, such as pricing systems, access fees, and traffic permits.</p> <p>2) Since freight transport are interrelated with international trade, global, regional and local concerns, the policy framework should be seen in a much broader context. Policies should be coordinated across all sectors and levels of governments, both vertically and horizontally, and internationally where appropriate.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>3) Please briefly explain why Yantai, Weifang, Xiamen and Guangdong are selected for pilot investment.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>4) The Netherlands has developed a checklist which enables expected impacts of national freight policies to be clearly identified under agreed indicators. Please consider this approach in your evaluation plan.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		XT, March 17, 2017: Comment cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	XT, Nov. 23, 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, Nov. 23, 2016: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	XT, Nov. 23, 2016: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	XT, Nov. 23, 2016: N/A.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	XT, Nov. 23, 2016: N/A.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	XT, Nov. 23, 2016: N/A.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>XT, Nov. 23, 2016: Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes 3 and 5.</p> <p>XT, March 17, 2017: Comment cleared. <i>All comments have been addressed and the project is ready for technical clearance. At this juncture we are unable to submit the project as a candidate for a future work program as we anticipate that sufficient resources may not be available for this project. Please note that council decision GEF/C.51/04 - Update on GEF-6 Resource Availability requests the Secretariat to effectively and proactively manage the projected shortfall in GEF-6. As mandated, the Secretariat will keep the issue under review and will advise of any changes</i></p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p><i>that may arise. Until then, this review sheet will be logged and the project will be marked technically cleared in the GEF PMIS system. Please consult with the OFP regarding resources that may be available for this project.</i></p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		