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

GEF ID:	**9204**		
Country/Region:	**Jordan**		
Project Title:	**A Systemic Approach to Sustainable Urbanization and Resource Efficiency in Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5543 (UNDP)**
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:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$2,640,000**
Co-financing:	**$24,700,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$27,340,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2016**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ming Yang**	Agency Contact Person:	**Lucas Black**

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]	MY 7/29/2015 Yes. It is aligned with Program 3 under Objective 2: Promoting integrated low-emission urban systems technologies and practices operationalized in given urban target area to demonstrate systemic impacts of mitigation options.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	MY 7/29/2015 Yes.	

[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
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	It is described on page 22 of the PIF.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MY 7/29/2015 Not completed at this time. In addition to innovation, on page 17, please write one paragraph for each of the following topics: 1. Sustainability; 2. Scaling-up; 3. Impact of market transformation to low carbon economy for the country. In addition, please consider generating other benefits for the project. For example, the background section of the PIF well addressed the issue of water shortages in buildings and the county, but the project components are not linked to resolving water shortage issues. The GEF SEC thinks that saving water is highly linked to saving energy in Jordan. Please try to integrate water efficiency into energy efficiency in this project. MY 8/14/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	Per your request new text (paragraphs) have been added on pgs. 17-18 on: Sustainability; Scaling-up; and Impact of market transformation to low carbon economy for the country. In terms of water saving benefits, references to such benefits have now been more clearly referenced in several parts of the PIF, particularly with regards to Component #1 and included as a local benefit indicator on pg. 17.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MY 7/29/2015 Yes, on pages 11-15.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound	MY 7/29/2015	Component #2 in the results framework

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Not completed at this time. In the Outputs on page 2 of the PIF, please add the number of ESCOs and RESCOs to be trained through Component 2. MY 8/14/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	in Table B has now been revised to include an additional output "At least 20 ESCOs/RESCOs accredited and capacitated via programme"
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MY 7/29/2015 Not completed at this time. Please indicate if this project is relevant to indigenous people. MY 8/14/2014 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	N/A â€“ there are no indigenous people in the targeted area (GAM)
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MY 7/29/2015 Yes. As of 7.29/2015, Jordan had a not used any STAR allocation in GEF-6, which is $7,198,995.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MY 7/29/2015 Yes. As of 7.29/2015, Jordan has a not used any STAR allocation in climate change in GEF-6, which is $2,000,000. This county can use up to $2,000,000 from BD and LD for this project.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	MY 7/29/2015 N/A	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	MY 7/29/2015 N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	MY 7/29/2015 N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MY 7/29/2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in boxes: 3, 5, and 6. MY 8/14/2014 Yes. All comments were addressed and the PIF was revised. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 29, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 14, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.