



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

GEF ID:	6924		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Promoting Climate Resilience in Viet Nam Cities		
GEF Agency:	ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,986	Project Grant:	\$4,566,210
Co-financing:	\$124,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$128,703,196
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Sonia Sandhu

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 ?	Yes, Vietnam is party to the UNFCCC and a non-Annex I country.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the Letter of Endorsement dated Aug 7th, 2014 is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
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>	<p>Yes, the project is aligned with the SCCF results framework and strategic objectives, CCA-1, CCA-2, and particularly CCA-3. However, the objectives listed are CCA-1 and CCA-2 only.</p> <p>Recommended action: By CEO endorsement, please consider including the CCA-3 as a strategic objective under the projects results framework.</p>	
	<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>	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>	Yes.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	Yes, the components and outcomes are clear, sound, and detailed.	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	The adaptation benefits and the additional reasoning are well-addressed. The baseline project "Secondary Cities Development Program" that will be funded by ADB will be enhanced by the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		SCCF-financed initiative so that that the secondary cities have access to finance for adaptation to climate change.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, the proposal states that a coordinated engagement will be undertaken with relevant authorities, and that consultations with stakeholders including local communities will take place during the design and implementation.	
	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)	Yes, the project describes the major risks and risk mitigation measures.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project appears properly coordinated and consistent with other related initiatives in the country and region.	
	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 	<p>Innovativeness: This project will work through local governance to address adaptation needs. An incentives mechanism will be established to reward/incentivise adaptation by cities.</p> <p>Sustainability: Unclear -- please provide clarifications on how sustainability of this</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>project will be ensured.</p> <p>Potential for scaling up: Unclear -- please provide clarifications on how scaling up will be facilitated by the project.</p> <p>Update 8/21/2014: More detailed descriptions will be provided at CEO Endorsement. Sustainability will be based on local ownership, mainstreaming of climate change considerations into urban planning and investment, incentives, and Government commitment. Mechanisms for scaling-up will be designed during the project preparation phase, and could encompass scaling up of the physical investments, knowledge dissemination/capacity building, financial resources, etc. This is satisfactory.</p>	
	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>Not clear. While the funding and cofinancing appear adequate, total project cost in Table B needs to be corrected.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide the correct total in Table B.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 8/21/2014: The correction has been made.	
	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?	Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, at below 5% of the Subtotal.	
	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?	Not clear. The PPG is requested and the amount does not deviate from the norm. However, the agency fee under the Total PPG Amount in Section E is incorrect. Recommended action: Please correct the Agency Fee amount under the Total PPG Amount. Update 8/21/2014: The needed correction has been made.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant 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:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see #13, 16, and 19. Update 8/21/2014: The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Comments under #4.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 12, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 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.