



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

GEF ID:	5717		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	Promotion of Low Carbon Urban Transport Systems in the Philippines		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5304 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$15,840,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,579,726
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Rakshya Thapa

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes, an endorsement letter was signed by the OFP on October 31, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes, it is in line with CCM-4.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	HT, March 12, 2014: Please address the following comments: a) With regard to EVs, will the project target buses or include cars? Please explain. b) Please provide rough estimate of the cost of the AGT systems. Will the project construct and operate the AGT systems within the project duration? c) Please provide rough estimate of the cost of the electricity charging	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>infrastructure.</p> <p>d) Regarding centers of excellent, please describe how the centers will be sustained after the GEF project.</p> <p>e) Regarding 3.1.2, please maximize the adoption of internationally accepted standards for on-road and laboratory testing and minimize or eliminate the development of new standards. This will speed manufacturer compliance with low-carbon policies.</p> <p>f) Light-duty hybrid vehicles are mainstream commodities (e.g., Prius). Therefore, activities to promote light duty hybrids should be carefully prescribed. Please clarify if any light-duty vehicles activities are in the project.</p> <p>Heavy-duty hybrid vehicles (e.g., buses) are not yet mainstream and the activities can be designed accordingly.</p> <p>g) We would like to see the project emphasize public procurement more strongly has public fleets could be early adopters for EVs and hybrids.</p> <p>HT, March 18, 2014:</p> <p>a) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Information has been provided. Comment cleared. On the AGT system, please explain in detail by the CEO Endorsement stage how to design it in the context of sustainable city and connect the system with other components of the project.</p> <p>c) d) e) f) g) Explanation and information have been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>HT, March 12, 2014: Please address the following comments: a) Please provide rough numbers of electric and hybrid vehicles, and of AGT systems in the Philippines in three cases: i) current status; ii) future projection without GEF support; iii) future projection with GEF support.</p> <p>b) Please estimate direct CO2 emissions reduction brought by hybrid buses and the AGT systems, and indirect CO2 emissions reduction, which includes reduction by replication, by the CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>HT, March 18, 2014: Information has been provided. Comment cleared. The incremental reasoning is sound and appropriate.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>HT, March 12, 2014: Yes, Civil Society Groups are one of the stakeholders of the project.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,</p>	<p>HT, March 12, 2014: Please rate the risk of low level of awareness and appreciation of local chief executives (Table on page 11).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)	HT, March 18, 2014: Comment cleared.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, March 12, 2014: Please provide a detailed strategy to create synergies with the CIF project in the Philippines by the CEO endorsement stage. HT, March 18, 2014: Comment cleared.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	HT, March 12, 2014: The PIF describes that the financing strategy (DOTC's guarantee fund) will ensure sustainability of project results (page 10). Please be more specific about this strategy. HT, March 18, 2014: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. Please elaborate the financing strategy to ensure sustainability of project results by the CEO Endorsement stage.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	HT, March 12, 2014: Yes, GEF Project Management Cost (PMC) is less than 5% of the GEF grant before PMC.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	HT, March 12, 2014: PPG is requested, which is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	HT, March 12, 2014: There is no non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>HT, March 12, 2014: Not at this stage. Please address the comments.</p> <p>HT, March 18, 2014: All comments are cleared. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>HT, March 18, 2014: Please address the following items at the CEO Endorsement stage:</p> <p>a) detailed design of the AGT system in the context of sustainable city and connectivity of the system with other components of the project;</p> <p>b) estimates of direct CO2 emissions reduction brought by hybrid buses and the AGT systems, and of indirect CO2 emissions reduction, which includes reduction by replication;</p> <p>c) detailed strategy to create synergies with the CIF project in the Philippines</p> <p>d) financing strategy to ensure</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sustainability of project results.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 12, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 18, 2014	
	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.**