

Philippines: Metro Manila Urban Transport Integration Project (World Bank)

Operational Program: ()

GEF Secretariat Review: Concept Clearance

Financing (millions):	\$0.00	Total (millions):	\$0.00	938
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Summary

The proposed project will involve the establishment and operation of a new network of bicycle lanes in Markina, Manila.

Expected Project Outputs:Feasibility StudyProject Duration (months):2

Basic Project Data

Project GEF ID:

Staff

Program Manager	Ahuja	
Implementing Agency	World Bank	
Regional Coordinator	Sally Burningham	
Executing Agency	National Government	

Processing Status	Date
Processing Stage	
Concept Pipeline Discussion	10/21/99
PDF A - Agency Approval	
PDF B - CEO Approval	
Bilateral Project Review Meeting	
Work Progrom Submission and Approv	
CEO Endorsement	
Agency Approval	
Project Completion	

Cost Summary

Cost Item	Years	Amount (USD'000)
Preparation		
- PDF A		\$0.03
- PDF B		
- PDF C		
Project Allocation		
- Executing Agency Fees and Costs		\$0.00
- Project Managment Costs		\$0.00
- Other Incremental Costs		\$0.00

Completeness of Documentation

Focal Point	Budget	Logical Framework
STAP Review	Increment Cost	Length
Disclosure of Administration Co	st	Complete Cover Sheet \Box

1. Country Ownership

Country Eligibility

Philippines ratified UNFCCC on August 2, 1994.

Evidence of Country Ownership/Country-Drivenness

Mayor of Marikina seems enthusiatic.

2. Program and Policy Conformity

Portfolio Balance

This would be the first project in OP 11 on non-motorized transport.

Program Conformity

The concept is in conformity with OP 11.

Replicability

The project will demonstrate and publicize results and will help the replication in other urban area in Philippines.

Potential Global Environmental Benefits of Project

To be demonstrated.

Sustainability

Baseline Course of Action

?

Alternative Action Supported by project

Estabilshment and operation of a new network of bicycle (and pedestrian?) lanes in Marikina.

Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy

Private Sector Involvement

3. Appropriateness of GEF Financing

Incremental Cost

As this is the first of these projects under OP 11, it is precedent-setting. It will crucial to establish incrementality of the GEF alternative over the baseline. This will need to be examined at a later stage.

Appropriateness of Financial Modality Proposed

Financial Sustainability of the GEF-Funded Activity

Absorptive Capability

Date last Updated: 10/22/99 3:43:35 PM

Cost Effectiveness

4. Coordination with Other Institutions

Collaboration

Complementarity with Ongoing Activities

5. Responsiveness to Comments and Evaluations

Core Commitments

Linkages

Consultation and Coordination

Consistency w/previous upstream consultations, project preparation work, and processing conditions

Monitoring & evaluation: Minumum GEF Standards, ME plan, proposed indicators, lessons from PIRs and Project Lessons Study

Indicators

Implementing Agencies' Comments

STAP Review

Council members' Comments

Technical Assurances

Convention Secretariat

Other Technical Comments

It is not clear from the concept if pedestrian lanes are also involved and if so, are they separate from bicycle lanes.

Further Processing

Recommended for inclusion in the OP 11 pipeline provided clarifications are provided on which components would the GEF fund and how incrementality would be established.