GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9666**		
Country/Region:	**Global**		
Project Title:	**Urban Networking to Complement and Extend the Reach of the Sustainable Cities IAP**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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:		Project Grant:	**$2,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$2,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$4,000,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Xiaomei Tan**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. The project aligns with GEF-6 CCM-2 Program 3 and Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot. It complements the Global Knowledge Sharing Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC).	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. The project's three components â€“ city access point to services, learning events, and knowledge management â€“ are adequate to achieve the expected outcomes.	
	3. Is the project consistent with	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: This is a global	

[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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	project, but will support on-the-ground urban strategies in 27 cities across 11 countries. In that sense, it will contribute to the implementation of SDG 11 and Paris Agreement.	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. The project identified the root causes of global environmental degradation.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. Although there is no direct GHG emissions benefit, the project will lead to low carbon approaches being integrated into at least 15 of the 27 IAP cities, which in the long run will result in significant mitigation and adaptation benefits.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. Gender equality and women's empowerment are taken into consideration.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. The total co-financing is $2 million.	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Risk mitigation measures are sound.	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. The qualitative rating is yet to be improved during project implementation.	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: N/A.	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes. The project is closely coordinated with GPSC, urban initiatives by bi-lateral and multi-lateral donors, as well as resources team's own initiatives.	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: NO	
	• The focal area allocation?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: N/A.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: N/A.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	XT, Oct. 27, 2016: Yes.	
Review Dates	First Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		