GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**9077**		
Country/Region:	**Global (Brazil, Cote d'Ivoire, China, India, Mexico, Malaysia, Peru, Paraguay, Senegal, Vietnam, South Africa)**		
Program Title:	**Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank, ADB and AfDB**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IAP-Cities; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 3; BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9; CW-1 Program 2;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Program Grant:	**$137,822,072**
Co-financing:	**$1,478,647,433**	Total Program Cost:	**$1,616,469,505**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
Program Manager:	**Xiaomei Tan**	Agency Contact Person:	**Stephen Hammer**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	XT, March 20, 2015: Yes. The project is in line with GEF-6 Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot.	
	2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/	XT, March 20, 2015: Please address the following questions: a) What is value-added and uniqueness of this IAP? b) How the IAP will help cities do	

[1] 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)?

Program Design	additional reasoning?	things differently? c) How will the global component and the child projects come together as a coherent package? d) How the child projects can help the mayors to implement integrated urban planning? e) Please ensure there is a clear linkage between the integrated urban planning and management support element and the actual investment catalyzed. Investments ought to enable cities to address priorities identified in the planning/strategy development process. XT, March 30, 2015: a) Description added. Comment cleared. b) Description added. Comment cleared. c) At the PPG phase, please further elaborate on the coherency between the global component and 11 child projects. d) At the PPG phase, please spell out how each child project can help city officials to implement integrated urban planning. e) Indicators 3.1 and 3.2 are designed to capture the linkage between the integrated urban planning and investment catalyzed. Comment cleared.	
	3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?	XT, March 20, 2015: Please address the following comments: a) Page 2, Outcome 1.1, indicator 2: please consider changing the word "institutionalization" as it is difficult to	

		understand. b) Page 5, row 6, Type of China co-financing: change "unknown" to specific sources. c) Page 6, table D: figures need to be consistent with numbers provided by each child project form. d) Page 6, table D: child projects' agency fees should be capped at 9%. e) Page 7, table E: add a footnote, another matrix, or a summary about contributions to other global environmental issues identified in table A (recognizing table E does not contain results/targets that may be relevant for this IAP). f) Page 7, Program Description, first paragraph, last sentence: please stop at: "It is expected that this pilot will serve as a proof of concept." g) Page 8: Please put some descriptions about the child projects, and describe the global-child interactions and rationale. Some council members may only read the PFD document, and not the child project annexes. h) Page 9, Please update the figure. On the last paragraph: one of the unique features of the IAP is the ability to engage directly with cities and also with a wide range of city-based institutions. Please start the list here with city-based institutions and include those that we have consulted, such as C-40, Rockefeller Foundation, 100 Resilient Cities, Compact of Mayors, City Alliance, and so on. The GEF Agencies can come after the listing of city-based institutions. i) Page 10, add a paragraph to	

		highlight the relevance and linkage of the IAP with the broader global policy discourse, including the Sustainable Development Goals, climate negotiations, and possibly other MEAs. j) Page 10: Tools and metrics and sustainability planning support are quite important pieces. Please expand further. Also, most of the paragraph under 2. Sustainable Planning Support may be used as an overall description of the IAP? If so, you could expand on the last sentence and make the linkage to the policy and strategy-relevant work more explicitly. k) Page 13: the figure duplicates the one on Page 12: risk - can we expand this section? (Note: we explained that the usual risk matrix may be forthcoming - please let us know). The second sentence of the final paragraph, starting "in other words" the meaning of this sentence is not clear. l) Page 12: the description of Intuitional Structure failed to capture the dialogues with non-GEF agencies and experts. m) Page 13, M&E section seems to be vague. Please touch upon the issue of monitoring mutual learning among the participating cities. How do we also capture the question of "what/how do we learn from the IAPs?" XT, March 30, 2015: k) The mitigation measures for the risk of failing to see results within the program lifetime need to be strengthened. Please consider this at the PPG phase. m) How to better capture the	

		benefits of mutual learning is still missing in the M&E section. Please address the concern at the PPG phase. All other comments cleared.	
	4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	XT, March 20, 2015: Please address the following comments: Page 11, Gender Consideration: Please bring the inclusive urban planning and their gender impacts upfront. The first sentence (gender consideration will vary by IAP city) is not a good start â€“ please consider revising this, and put it at the end, stressing the commitment of the IAP to ensure inclusion of gender considerations that address specific local concerns, priorities, and opportunities. XT, March 30, 2015: Description added. Comment cleared.	
	5. Does the program 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)	XT, March 20, 2015: The risk analysis can be further strengthened. XT, March 30, 2015: Risk analysis is strengthened. However, the mitigation measures for risk 3 need to be further developed. See comment k in box 3.	
	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	XT, March 20, 2015: No.	
	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	XT, March 20, 2015: Yes. The program coordinated with a wide range of initiatives and national/regional plans.	
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution	XT, March 20, 2015: The program implementation arrangement can be	

	arrangement adequate?	further strengthened. XT, March 30, 2015: The program implementation structure has been improved. More details will be provided at the PPG phase.	
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	XT, March 20, 2015: Not yet. XT, March 30, 2015: Yes.	
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?	XT, March 20, 2015: Yes.	
Resource Availability	11. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	XT, March 20, 2015: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	XT, March 20, 2015: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?	XT, March 20, 2015: It is IAP set-aside. XT, March 20, 2015: It is IAP set-aside. However, the total resources request is above $55 million. Please work with China to adjust the number.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
PFD Clearance	**Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?**	XT, March 20, 2015: Not at this time. Please address comments in box 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8. XT, March 30, 2015: Not at this point. Please address the funding resource issue in box 11. At the PPG phase, please address comments in boxes 2, 3, 5, and 8.	

		PFD recommended for clearance.	
Review Date (s)	Review*		
	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.**