



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5358</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Morocco</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Mainstreaming Climate Change in the National Logistics Strategy and Roll-Out of Integrated Logistics Platforms</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5181 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-3; CCM-4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,274,429</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$17,550,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$19,924,429</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Hiroaki Takiguchi</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Robert Kelly</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	HT, April 3, 2013: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	HT, April 3, 2013: Yes. The endorsement letter of Mr. Mohamed BENYAHIA, Operational Focal Point for Morocco, has been submitted.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	HT, April 3, 2013: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, April 3, 2013: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of	N/A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Yes, the project is in line with CCM-4 (sustainable transport) and CCM-3 (renewable energy).</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Yes.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Please address the following comments: a) The National Logistics Strategy aims to reduce road transport emissions by 35%. What kind of emissions does the objective mean? CO2 or local air pollutants or both? In addition, what about the baseline year? Please clarify. b) Will the 35% reduction target be achieved without GEF intervention? Please explain.</p> <p>HT, April 10, 2013: a) b) Clarification has been provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Comment cleared.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Please address the following comments: a) Does the PIF mean that the GEF intervention will be registered as a NAMA? Please clarify. b) Please describe activities in components 2 and 3 separately.</p> <p>Component 1: c) The scope of the National Logistics Strategy includes not only road transport but railways and marine transport. Based on this, please ensure that the GEF project will be designed to maximize the GHG reduction benefits through optimizing a combination of logistics modes. d) As the expected outcomes bring up regulations for low-carbon development of the transport sector, please add an output corresponding to the outcome.</p> <p>Component 2: e) Regarding the modal shift, please consider including formulation of policies and measures to enhance the shift in addition to development of a standard baseline.</p> <p>HT, April 10, 2013: a) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. b) Activities in components 2 and 3 have been described separately. Comment cleared. c) Clarification has been provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) The output has been added in line with the outcome. Comment cleared.</p> <p>e) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. Are <b>global environmental benefits</b> adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the <b>incremental/additional reasoning</b> sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>HT, April 3, 2013:</p> <p>Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) Please describe the methodologies and assumptions to estimate CO2 emission reductions. In addition, please clarify if the CO2 emission reduction is annual reduction or life-time reduction (e.g. 20 years).</p> <p>b) The direct emission reductions look small. If policy actions are brought by the GEF funding, the reductions brought by them will be counted as direct emission reductions. Please check the figures in the PIF.</p> <p>c) Incremental/additional reasoning will be checked after other comments are addressed.</p> <p>HT, April 10, 2013:</p> <p>a) b) Methodologies and assumptions to estimate CO2 emission reductions have been provided. Comment cleared. Please provide detailed estimation of GHG emission reductions, including the effects of multi-modal synergies, at the CEO Endorsement stage.</p> <p>c) Yes, the incremental reasoning is sound and appropriate.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:</p> <p>a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and</p> <p>b) how will the delivery of such</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is <b>public participation</b> , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Please explain how CSOs are involved in the project, especially activities regarding Zenata New Town.</p> <p>HT, April 10, 2013: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	11. Does the project take into account potential <b>major risks</b> , including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Fleet renewal will create obsolete vehicles as by-product. Please explain how these vehicles will be treated in an environmentally-sound manner.</p> <p>HT, April 10, 2013: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. Please provide the mitigation approach to this risk in detail at the CEO Endorsement stage.</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Yes.</p>	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. - Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will	<p>HT, April 3, 2013: Please address the following comments: a) Regarding innovative aspects, please address the comment in box 7c). If the project seeks for a best mix of logistics modes, it will be innovative. b) Please explain how to sustain road vehicle testing and eco-driving training financially after the GEF project.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project?</li> <li>- Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up.</li> </ul>	<p>HT, April 10, 2013:  a) Comment cleared.  b) Explanation has been provided.  Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the <b>project structure</b> sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the <b>cost-effectiveness</b> been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the <b>GEF funding and co-financing</b> per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>HT, April 3, 2013:  Please address the following comments:  a) On Component 1 (page 7), the summation of each co-financing amount does not add up to the total (\$6.65 million). Please correct it.  b) Given the activities for TA in Component 1, please justify the amount of co-financing (\$6.65 million).</p> <p>HT, April 10, 2013:  a) The number has been corrected.  Comment cleared.  b) Explanation has been provided.  Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any</p>	<p>HT, April 3, 2013:  Please address the following comments:  a) In Table C, please separate co-</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	comment on the indicated amount and composition of <b>cofinancing</b> ? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	financing of 6.5 million by source. b) Please give the UNDP's budget for Morocco and justify the level of co-financing (\$350,000).  HT, April 10, 2013: a) The Table has been revised. Comment cleared. b) Justification has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	HT, April 3, 2013: Yes. The project management cost is less than 5% of the indicative sub-total.	
	19. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	HT, April 3, 2013: There is no non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	HT, April 3, 2013: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments.  HT, April 10, 2013:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		All comments are cleared. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	HT, April 10, 2013: Please address the following items by the CEO Endorsement stage: a) specific activities to promote multi-modal synergies; b) clarification of activities registered as NAMAs and corresponding MRV systems; c) detailed estimation of GHG emission reductions with sound methodologies and assumptions, including the effects of multi-modal synergies; d) mitigation approach to the increase of obsolete vehicles.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	HT, April 10, 2013: Yes, PPG is approved.	
	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 03, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**