



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

GEF ID:	<b>5396</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Russian Federation</b>		
Project Title:	<b>National Urban Transport Improvement Project</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>World Bank</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>145582 (World Bank)</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-4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$9,132,420</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$270,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$279,132,420</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Hiroaki Takiguchi</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Angela Armstrong</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	HT, April 9, 2013: No. Please submit an endorsement letter signed by the Operational Focal Point.  HT, April 12, 2013: The WB has pledged to submit the letter of the endorsement as soon as possible.	
<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 9, 2013: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of	N/A	

	<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 9, 2013: The project is aligned with CCM-4 (sustainable transport). In this regard, please please use a new PIF template and fill in the Table A (Indicative Focal Area Strategy Framework).</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2013: The new template has been used. Comment cleared.</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 9, 2013: Please explain that the project has relevance to the UNFCCC National Communication submitted by the Russian Federation in 2010.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2013: The relevance to the UNFCCC National Communication has been added. Comment cleared.</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 9, 2013: Please provide the timelines of the baseline projects.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2013: The timeline of the baseline projects has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	

	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>a) Please add description that low-carbon transport will be reflected in the baseline projects (subcomponents 1.1 and 1.2) with the GEF intervention.</p> <p>b) Is the Federal Targeted Program for Sustainable Urban Transport Systems (subcomponent 1.3) the same as "a framework for federal targeted assistance for sustainable urban transport system (output 1.6)"? Please be consistent in using key words.</p> <p>c) Please include in the Federal Targeted Program (subcomponent 1.3) policies and measures to replicate the outcomes and outputs of Component 2 in other cities.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>d) St. Petersburg is one of the sites for the FIFA World Cup in 2018. Please explain whether the proposed activities will have bearing on the historic event. In this regard, please coordinate with UNDP which is implementing the transport project to address GHG emission reductions for 2018 World Cup, focusing on medium-sized cities.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2013:</p> <p>a) Description has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The text has been corrected. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Policies and measures for replication have been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) Explanation has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes. Please provide detailed estimation of GHG emission reductions with sound methodology and assumptions by the CEO Endorsement stage.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency</li> </ul>	HT, April 9, 2013: The project is innovative because it attempts to address a number of sustainable transport issues through piloting projects in the different types of cities. On the sustainability and potential for scaling up, please address the comment in box 7c).  HT, April 12, 2013: Policies and measures for replication	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		
	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 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?	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) On the GEF funding for Component 1, there is inconsistency between the PIF and the Project Concept Note (PCN). Please correct it.</p> <p>b) Please justify the amount of GEF funding (\$5.5 million) for Component 2.</p> <p>HT, April 12, 2013: a) The number has been corrected. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Justification has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	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, April 9, 2013: Yes, the World Bank is co-financing \$124 million as Hard Loan.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	HT, April 9, 2013: On the project management cost, there is inconsistency between the PIF and the PCN. Please correct it	

		HT, April 12, 2013: The number has been corrected. Comment cleared. The project cost will be covered by co-financing.	
	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, April 12, 2013: PPG is not requested.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	HT, April 9, 2013: There is no non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	HT, April 9, 2013: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments. In addition, please use a new template for a revised PIF, which is available at: <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708">http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708</a>	

		HT, April 12, 2013: Technical clearance is recommended. The WB has pledged to submit the letter of the endorsement as soon as possible.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	HT, April 12, 2013: Please provide detailed estimation of GHG emission reductions with sound methodology and assumptions at the CEO Endorsement stage.	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 09, 2013	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 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.**