



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF Program ID:	4638		
Country/Region:	Regional (Bangladesh, China, Mongolia)		
Program Title:	Asian Sustainable Transport and Urban Development Program (ASTUD)		
GEF Agency:	ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-4; Others; Others; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$13,611,000
Co-financing:	\$988,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,001,611,000
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Bruce dunn

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes, (Bangladesh) By letter signed on April 20, 2011 (Mongolia) By letter signed on September 13, 2011 (People's Republic of China) By letter signed on August 30, 2011
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes, ADB has the comparative advantage in implementing projects in the field of transport and urban development.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	HT September 14, 2011: N/A

	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes, the project fits into the ADB's Sustainable Transport Initiative.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes. See the comment in Box 8.
Program Consistency	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	HT September 14, 2011: No. Please address the following comments. 1) While climate adaptation is not included in the Focal Area Strategy Framework and the Program Result Framework, it is included in Programmatic Justification as a component (e.g. page 7, 8, and 18). Please revise it. If adaptation is included in the future tranches, revised or new PFD should be submitted. 2) CD-1 and CD-2 are listed as the Focal Area Objectives. However, those objectives in the GEF5 strategies focus on cross-cutting capacity development for the synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions, including not only climate change but also biodiversity and/or land degradation. Therefore, the objectives (knowledge sharing) in the proposal should be covered in CCM-4, and not as CD-1 and 2. Please revise accordingly. HT September 15, 2011: Comments cleared. As an additional comment, an error still remains on page 18 of the PFD, which shows allocation of \$2.7 million LDCF for Bangladesh. This should be deleted.
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.

	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes, generally.
Program Design	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes, mostly. By the stage of the CEO endorsement, the baseline project in a third city in PRC should be nominated in accordance with the program.
	12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?	HT September 14, 2011: 1) The overall objective of the programmatic approach is to secure a large-scale and sustained impact on the global environment by implementing medium to long-term strategies. Hence, the totality of the proposed program should be always explained, not limited to the #1 tranche. 2) Please set forth the project implementation timeline for the baseline projects and the GEF-financed activities under the program. HT September 15, 2011: Comments cleared.
	15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.

	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT September 14, 2011: Not clearly. Since the proposed program covers broad areas in the field of transport and urban development, coordination with other initiatives should be necessary in order to enhance synergy and avoid duplication. This should be addressed by the stage of the CEO endorsement. HT September 15, 2011: Comment cleared.
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	HT September 14, 2011: Please address the comment on the project implementation timeline in Box 14. HT September 15, 2011: Comment cleared.
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes. The GEF funding for the project management is approximately 1% of the total GEF grant.
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	HT September 14, 2011: Please explain what activity the co-financing by the Bilateral Aid Agency (Agence Francaise de Development) is used for. HT September 15, 2011: Comment cleared.
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	HT September 14, 2011: Yes.
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	

	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Council comments?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?	HT September 14, 2011: Please address the above comments (Box 8, 14 and 22). HT September 15, 2011: Comments cleared. The program has been recommended by PM for CEO clearance.
	28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	HT September 15, 2011: 1) Please see the comments in Box 11, 14 and 18. 2) For estimating the incremental global environmental benefits, preliminary methodology and assumptions are applied in the PFD. The incremental global environmental benefits should be explained in a sound and appropriate manner at the stage of the CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 14, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	

Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.