



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9342</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Serbia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Climate Smart Urban Development Challenge</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5551 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1 Program 2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,950,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$10,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$12,000,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 18, 2016</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ming Yang</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Marina Olshanskaya,</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MY 12/1/2015 Yes. It is aligned with CCM Program 3 of Objective 2 of the GEF6 strategy.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 12/1/2015 Yes, the project is consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	MY 12/1/2015 Not completed at this time.  In the PIF, please write one paragraph	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?	<p>to address each of the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drivers of global environmental degradation. What are the root causes or drivers to non-smart or unsustainable urban development? How to deal with these drivers and root causes?</li> <li>2. Innovation. Why this project is innovative to the country? When compared with other existing or historical projects for urban development, what is special in this proposed project?</li> <li>3. Sustainability. How the results of this project will continually be applied or used or in operation after the project implementation period is over?</li> <li>4. Market transformation. How this project will bring transformational changes to Serbia in terms of sustainable urban development?</li> <li>5. Scaling-up. How will the project results (public information data, business models, etc.) be applied to other cities or urban areas that are beyond the scope of this proposed project.</li> </ol> <p>MY 12/16/2015 Yes, comments were addressed and</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the PIF was revised.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MY 12/1/2015 Not at this time. Since the objective of the project is to promote innovation and community engagement for climate smart urban development (CSUD), the baseline (on page 5) should focus on the issues that block innovation and community engagement for CSUD. Please provide more information on the current status and future projection on the impact of unavailability and availability of open data on innovation and community engagement for CSUD.</p> <p>MY 12/16/2015 Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MY 12/1/2015 Not at this time. The sub-components of INV in components 1 and 2 are more related to TA than in tangible investment. Please consider developing a data center with hardware and software programs that will provide public goods, such as updated information on climate smart urban development to deal with the challenges in this area.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MY 12/16/2015 Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MY 12/1/2015 Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	MY 12/1/2015 Yes, as of 12/1/2015, Serbia had a total STAR resource of \$3,338,430, per the GEF PMIS.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MY 12/1/2015 No. As of 12/1/2015, Serbia had a total of CCM resource of \$1,785,276 per the GEF PMIS. Please reduce the budget of the project accordingly, or contact the OFP to issue another endorsement letter that allows the project to use about \$200,000 from BD or LD.  MY 12/16/2015 Yes, comments were addressed, the PIF was revised, and a new LoE was submitted.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	MY 12/1/2015 N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	MY 12/1/2015 N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	MY 12/1/2015	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MY 12/1/2015 Not at this time. Please address the comments in boxes: 3, 4, 5 and 7.</p> <p>MY 12/16/2015 Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p> <p>The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 01, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 16, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 05, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.