



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

GEF ID:	<b>9042</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Moldova</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Moldova Sustainable Green Cities – Catalyzing Investment in Sustainable Green Cities in the Republic of Moldova Using a Holistic Integrated Urban Planning Approach</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5492 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,639,726</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$30,320,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$33,059,726</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 28, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Xiaomei Tan</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>John O'Brien</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes, the project is aligned with CCM-1 and CCM-2. However, there are significant discrepancies between table A and D in terms of focal areas resources allocation.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes, the project is consistent with Moldova's national strategy on low emissions development.
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	XT, March 24, 2015: The description on issues of market transformation and innovation should be strengthened.  XT, March 30, 2015:

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Please refer to GEF 2020 Strategy and GEF-6 Programming Directions for info related to market transformation and innovation.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>XT, March 24, 2015:</p> <p>Description on incremental reasoning needs to be strengthened. Particularly, please respond to the following comments:</p> <p>a) There is little baseline info on innovation in Moldova or in the city of Chisinau. Without the baseline info, it is difficult to evaluate the added value of UNDP interventions.</p> <p>b) Some urban investments are highly cost-effective in terms of CO2 reductions per dollar invested. However, other potential investments are less cost-effective. Please explain what criteria UNDP use to justify a cost-effective investment.</p> <p>c) What is the incremental reasoning for revising Green Urban Development Plan of Chisinau?</p> <p>XT, March 30, 2015:</p> <p>a) Baseline info provided. Comments cleared.</p> <p>b) In PPG stage, please explain why UNDP's cost-effectiveness is defined as a cost of \$10 GEF funding per tonne of CO2.</p> <p>c) Comments cleared.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>XT, March 24, 2015:</p> <p>Overall, the project design seems fragmented, with little resources spreading around 5 components. It is not explained what criteria is used to select the three proposed sectors: municipal waste, transport, and public buildings (see comment b in box 4).</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>a) Please explain the innovative nature of the proposed innovation hub. The function of the hub</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>(identify, develop, and secure financing) sounds like an office tasked to raise funding for urban investment. While a real innovation hub represents a genuinely new and exciting model for supporting entrepreneurs, according to research by the University of Oxford (<a href="http://cii.oii.ox.ac.uk/what-is-a-tech-innovation-hub-anyway/">http://cii.oii.ox.ac.uk/what-is-a-tech-innovation-hub-anyway/</a>). Please consider change the name of innovation hub.</p> <p>b) The proposed extensive trainings will only focus on the hub's 3-4 staff, or include a broader range of audiences?</p> <p>c) Please clarify if "enhance the climate resilience of the City of Chisinau" is the only mission of the Hub, as listed in table B, component 1.</p> <p>d) Please see comment c) in box 4.</p> <p>e) Please justify the needs for developing the new tools. Especially, it is not clarified what "various interventions" mean. Further, component 5 is already dedicated to various methodologies and tools.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>f) Please explain what is the linkage between Green Urban Development Plan and National Waste Management Strategy for Moldova? Integrated urban planning for waste management is not spelled out.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>g) Please briefly explain the scale of "public procurement" in Moldova and justify why the fuel efficiency standards only cover "public procurement".</p> <p>Component 4:</p> <p>h) Please justify the need for a waste management strategy dedicated to public buildings. In fact component 2 is totally dedicated to waste management.</p> <p>i) Please explain why a signed agreement between two governments is considered as an outcome.</p> <p>j) What are the expected results of those trainings</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>provided to private businesses, banks, and companies on the ESCO mechanism? How are they going to contribute to National Database on Energy Consumption in public buildings?</p> <p>Component 5:</p> <p>k) Please explain why the three ministries have to lead the replication and dissemination activities. What is their motivations of promoting integrated Urban Planning?</p> <p>l) What roles of municipal governments will play in Component 5?</p> <p>m) What kind of methodology do you envision to develop? How can they contribute to the dissemination of the integrated urban planning approach? There are many ready-made methodologies available already.</p> <p>XT, 30 March 2015:</p> <p>a) In the PPG stage, please explain what innovative technologies or business models the hub is going to promote. Please also elaborate on the proposed public-private partnership and how it will play a role in Moldova's sustainable urbanization process.</p> <p>b) In the PPG stage, please explain who the targeted audiences are, and why.</p> <p>c) The hub's functions need to be clearly defined.</p> <p>XT, 30 March 2015:</p> <p>a) In the PPG stage, please explain what innovative technologies or business models the hub is going to promote. Please also elaborate on the proposed public-private partnership and how it will play a role in Moldova's sustainable urbanization process.</p> <p>b) In the PPG stage, please explain who the targeted</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>audiences are, and why.</p> <p>c) The hub's functions need to be clearly defined.</p> <p>d) Comment cleared.</p> <p>e) The revision suddenly added "innovative tool", but without definition of what it is, neither justification of why it is necessary. In the PPG stage please address these issues.</p> <p>f) Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) In the PPG stage please provide details on Moldova's public procurement program as part of baseline.</p> <p>h) Comment cleared.</p> <p>k) in the PPG stage, please explain how the three ministries can work together to ensure "integrated" planning at the sub-national level.</p> <p>l) Municipal governments should play an important role in replication work. Please consider involving municipal governments in the process.</p> <p>m) The methodology component should be strengthened in the PPG stage.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes.
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• The STAR allocation?	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes.
	• The focal area allocation?	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes.
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	
	• Focal area set-aside?	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>XT, March 24, 2015: Not at this time. Please address comments in box 1, 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>XT, March 30, 2015: Recommend for CEO approval with the caveat that the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		project will address issues in box 3, 4, and 5 during the PPG phase.
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument</i> : 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?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

<sup>3</sup> 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.