



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

GEF ID:	9042		
Country/Region:	Moldova		
Project Title:	Sustainable Green Cities : Catalyzing Investment in Sustainable Green Cities in the Republic of Moldova Using a Holistic Integrated Urban Planning Approach		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5492 (UNDP)
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; CCM-2 Program 3;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$39,930,000	Total Project Cost:	\$42,669,726
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	John O'Brien

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, 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.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	XT, March 24, 2015:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>The description on issues of market transformation and innovation should be strengthened.</p> <p>XT, March 30, 2015: Please refer to GEF 2020 Strategy and GEF-6 Programming Directions for info related to market transformation and innovation.</p>	
	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>	

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<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 (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 (http://cii.oii.ox.ac.uk/what-is-a-tech-innovation-hub-anyway/). Please consider change the name of innovation hub.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<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>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<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 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>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<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 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</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>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.	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Availability of Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	XT, March 24, 2015: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	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 project will address issues in box 3, 4, and 5 during the PPG phase.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?	<p>MY 12/16/2016</p> <p>Yes, there are some changes which are related to addressing the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		comments of the German Council member and STAP.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>MY 12/16/2016 Not really. Per the current design, the project focuses too much on TA, not really project demonstration. The Agency did not show what to demonstrate. Please articulate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The type, size and location of project(s) to demonstrate; 2. The objective of the demonstration; 3. The plan and ways to use the \$31 million budget in the project demonstration; 4. The results to achieve from the demonstration; 5. Sustainability of the demonstration; 6. Global environment benefits of the demonstration; 7. Indicators to be used to evaluate the success or failure of the demonstration projects. <p>MY 6/22/2017 Yes. Issues were addressed and cleared.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>MY 12/16/2016 It cannot be judged because the demonstration projects have not been presented clearly. See the comments</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		in Box 2. MY 6/22/2017 Yes. Issues were addressed and cleared.	
	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)	MY 12/16/2016 Not completed. Please take into account potential risks of the demonstration projects. MY 6/22/2017 Yes. Issues were addressed and cleared.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MY 12/16/2016 Not completed. Please provide a document with all co-financing letters to match Table C on page 4 of the CEO ER document. MY 6/22/2017 Not yet. The Agency's response reads "See all co-financing letters attached separately". But the re-submission does not include the co-financing document. MY 7/5/2017 Yet, letters were provided and issues have been cleared.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MY 12/16/2016 Not completed.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		The numbers in the TTL do not match these in the CEO ER document. Please correct them. MY 6/22/2017 Yes. Issues were addressed and cleared.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	MY 12/16/2016 Not applicable.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MY 12/16/2016 Yes, it is stated on pages 8-9.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MY 12/16/2016 Yes, it is stated on page 13.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MY 12/16/2016 Yes, it is stated on page 11.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEFSEC 	MY 12/16/2016 Not at this time. Please review GEF SEC comments at the PIF stage and address these comments one by one. MY 6/22/2017	

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Yes. Issues were addressed and cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	MY 12/16/2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	MY 12/16/2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	MY 12/16/2016 Not applicable.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>MY 12/16/2016 Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 2, 4, 5, 6, and 11.</p> <p>Other issues to address:</p> <p>1. Focal Area Outcomes in Table A on page 1 duplicate and they do not look good. Please consider revising them with the following keys in mind: CCM-1 Program 1 is for general low-carbon technologies and mitigation options (focusing on policies); CCM-2 Program 3 is for low-emission urban systems (focusing on technology demonstration).</p> <p>2. The budget (\$670,000 of GEF grant and \$5,250,000 of co-financing) is too much for Component 1, a TA. Please consider reallocate some funds from Component 1 to project demonstration, namely the INV sub-component of Component 2.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>MY 6/22/2017 Not completed at this time. Please address the comments in Box 5.</p> <p>Also, again: Focal Area Outcomes in Table A on page 1 duplicate and they do not look good. Please consider revising them with the following keys in mind: CCM-1 Program 1 is for general low-carbon technologies and mitigation options (focusing on policies); CCM-2 Program 3 is for low-emission urban systems (focusing on technology demonstration). Should the Agency need help, please call the PM.</p> <p>MY 7/5/2017 Yet, all issues have been cleared. The PM recommends the CEO to endorse this project.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 16, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 22, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 05, 2017	