

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: April 14, 2015

Screeener: Christine Wellington-Moore

Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 9077

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Global (Brazil, Cote d'Ivoire, China, India, Mexico, Malaysia, Peru, Paraguay, Senegal, Vietnam, South Africa)

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank, ADB and AfDB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNEP, UNDP, IDB, AfDB ADB, DBSA, UNIDO

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the efforts of the World Bank and agencies in preparing this PFD, and acknowledges the considerable efforts to date, within a very short time span, to consolidate this proposal. STAP recognizes, therefore, that there a number of areas left to be completed to flesh out the PFD and its results framework. The following review addresses broad areas for consideration to act as guidance for the follow-on consultations and steps taken to complete the full project document. STAP was also mindful of the GEF2020 Strategy priorities as it carried out this review, recalling that the IAPs would be expected to:-

- (a) address the drivers of environmental degradation;
- (b) deliver integrated solutions;
- (c) enhance resilience and adaptation;
- (d) ensure complementarity and synergies, especially in climate finance; and
- (e) focus on choosing the right influencing model.

Comments are laid out by category below.

Stakeholder Engagement best practices

Acknowledging that in approaching complex environmental problems, stakeholder engagement and collective action is critical. The overarching objective of the PFD document speaks to broad inclusiveness in the pursuit of urban development planning and implementation, stressing a "network" approach to help pull the complex web of urban stakeholders onto a path of united vision and effort (see page 9 of PFD).

The strength of many GEF initiatives is typically in the technical and institutional components. Often social science components which can enhance performance of GEF interventions are lacking. It was also recognized that the link between local action and global impacts/benefits in this context must be supported with a clear conceptual framework, such that local intent and action is in step with national, regional and international actions. In addition, many governments marginalize informal settlements in their formal decision-making processes. As such, the IAP should attempt to address this challenge as it may undermine success in other areas. In addition, the STAP has emphasized the need to look closely at successful actions for devolving environmental management decision making to appropriate levels.

One can compare and contrast the traditional isolated impact approach with the collective impact approach (Kania, J.; Kramer, M. 2011. "Collective Impact". Stanford Social Innovation Review. See also <http://www.fsg.org/OurApproach/WhatIsCollectiveImpact.aspx>)

Isolated Impacts:- Funders select individual grantees that offer the most promising solutions

Collective Impacts:- Funders and implementers understand that social problems, and their solutions, arise from the interaction of many organizations within a larger system

Isolated Impacts:- Non-profits work separately and compete to produce the greatest independent impact

Collective Impact:- Progress depends on working toward the same goal and measuring the same things

Isolated Impacts:- Evaluation attempts to isolate a particular organization's impact

Collective Impacts:- Large scale impact depends on increasing cross-sector alignment and learning among many organisations

Isolated Impacts:- Large scale change is assumed to depend on scaling a single organization

Collective Impacts:- Corporate and government sectors are essential partners

Isolated Impacts:- Corporate and government sectors are often disconnected from the efforts of foundations and nonprofits

Collective Impacts:- Organizations actively coordinate their action and shared lessons learned.

Over time the GEF has moved towards the collective approach, though it could be made more comprehensive and better embedded in GEF operations. Collective impacts provide a significant shift away from the traditional paradigm of "isolated impact," because the underlying premise of collective impact is that no single organization can create large-scale, lasting social change alone. This has been transposed to tackling environmental problems as well, since the social issues actually heavily influence success in tackling environmental problems at scale even where there are technological solutions available. Typically there is no "silver bullet" solution to systemic problems, and these problems cannot be solved by simply scaling or replicating one organization or program.

Collective impact is best employed for problems that are complex and systemic rather than technical in nature. Collective impact initiatives are currently being employed to address a wide variety of issues around the world, including education, healthcare, homelessness, the environment, and community development. Many of these initiatives are already showing concrete results, reinforcing the promise of collective impact in solving complex social problems.

This gradual change in thinking has been well researched, culminating in 2011 with the publishing of a critical article by Kania et. al (2011) , which, based on evidence of success and failure in tackling complex and systemic problems, was able to devolve five conditions of collective impact success.

Conditions of Collective Impact Success

Collective impact is more rigorous and specific than collaboration among organizations. There are five conditions that, together, lead to meaningful results from collective impact:

1. Common Agenda: All participants share a vision for change that includes a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving the problem through agreed-upon actions.
2. Shared Measurement: All participating organizations agree on the ways success will be measured and reported, with a short list of common indicators identified and used for learning and improvement.
3. Mutually Reinforcing Activities: A diverse set of stakeholders, typically across sectors, coordinate a set of differentiated activities through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.
4. Continuous Communication: All players engage in frequent and structured open communication to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation.
5. Backbone Support: An independent, funded staff dedicated to the initiative provides ongoing support by guiding the initiative's vision and strategy, supporting aligned activities, establishing shared measurement practices, building public will, advancing policy, and mobilizing resources

The STAP has consulted with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development on their experience in applying this approach to their urban projects, and they reported significant improvements in accomplishment of project objectives that this model is endorsed by the White House council for Community Solutions. A follow-up study and updated guidance was also published in the Stanford Social Review in

2012 to highlight successes of the performance of initiatives by various municipalities as well as large private sector and CSO entities and foundations (eg. UN GAIN, Communities That Care, Calgary Homeless Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, AVINA).

STAP has passed on information to the lead agency regarding experts in this area who could be consulted as the programme document is further developed, along with the Global Knowledge Platform and other child projects. Indeed the Capacity Building subsection of the Global Platform document (see page 9 of the concept note) discusses how to overcome the cacophony of local city decisions that can threaten a united development path. Also in terms of the Global Knowledge platform, there can be support provided to all involved to show how they can be involved in the collective impact community (<http://www.collectiveimpactforum.org/>). This approach does seem to be emerging as the definitive way in which private and public entities (including funding bodies) are tackling complex social and environment problems, including leveraging and sourcing funding. Also in its favor is the fact that there has been high level, peer-reviewed research involved in devolving these principles for stakeholder engagement.

Results Framework

Looking at the PFD document, to measure a city's "increased scope and depth of integrated urban sustainability planning management policies" will be challenging against a baseline, as will the other proposed metrics. So the rating system alluded to in Component 1 will be a critical part of the M&E framework and methodology. Similarly for Component 2 the proposed core performance framework is difficult to understand without putting the concept into practice. A few details are provided in the M&E section on page 24 but there remain many uncertainties as to how this will be achieved in practice given the wide variations between cities as is evident from the section outlining the Child projects.

On the issue of process indicators, one might be included to measure the extent of stakeholder engagement as it is so critical to the IAP success. The aim of the IAP pilot to "ensure broad engagement with stakeholders across a city" is commendable, as is having a process-focused indicator to measure change over the life of the IAP program. Indeed the 5 conditions of success of the Collective impact model could be used as a ratings system based on increasingly comprehensive permutations of these criteria, with a 1 rating meaning perhaps only 1 condition is being met, and 5 meaning all have been met. This is also an important aspect of learning from, and ultimately capitalizing on, the IAP experience to determine best practices in stakeholder engagement, and other processes that may be identified as critical, foundational actions for Cities integrated projects.

STAP does not question the need for selected Cities to have some latitude in selecting indicators for their locally specific work. However, there should be an assessment process or preferably a common conceptual framework to ensure that the indicators selected are appropriate to measure the areas of performance critical to the specific interventions, relevant to the overall IAP knowledge needs, benchmarking, and comparability. indeed the PFD and Global Knowledge Platform documents both cite a medium level risk of lack of alignment between child projects and overall programme goals. A comprehensive, suite of locally-specific indicators might be achieved through use of a common conceptual framework such that all projects would use similar criteria in determining if the suite of indicators selected covers all the critical areas to be monitored. STAP has developing a similar process for socio-ecological systems, and application of it under the Food Security IAP is already underway. This approach could also be used in the Cities IAP as the program develops.

STAP welcomes the opportunity for research on other urban sustainability indicators, and hopes that work for instance on urban metabolism indicators can be included going forward. In addition, in order to contribute to the GEF 2020 IAP strategic priority as relates to resilience and adaptation, open source indices for resilience such as the Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index (ND-GAIN) might be consulted as there exists a clear methodology that can assist with indicator selection, data sources, and rationale for indicator selection.

(iii) Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management is a key part of the IAP if the ambition is to widely disseminate information from lessons learned to other cities. STAP welcomes the Global Knowledge Platform as a key component of this effort. STAP looks forward to engaging with this component of the IAP going forward.

The PFD makes reference to the importance of comprehensive, evidence-based planning, and states that the IAP is "designed to function as proof of concept". The Global Knowledge Platform, however, emphasizes a construct that speaks to swapping of information between Cities, but reporting nothing back to the GEF

and its donors to indicate whether investment was impactful or not. The difference between information gathering and knowledge generation is not clearly delimited, and there is no indication of any plans to develop overarching knowledge questions into a centralized Knowledge Management Strategy for the IAP and then the GEF. (For example: What are the overarching knowledge goals of the IAP? In what ways did the IAP contribute to the GEF 2020 strategic vision? Is the sum of the outputs of the child projects likely to contribute to overall outcomes and ultimately the overall objective of the IAP? What are the best conditions for successful investment?). Developing a Knowledge Management strategy will help inform the Results Framework such that indicators utilized will need to be as objective as possible, and quantifiable where feasible. Without such an approach resulting in clear information flows back to the GEF partnership, including its donors, there will be no way for any objectively derived conclusions to be made about why an intervention succeeded or failed, nor to capture best practices for replication and scale-up. This is critical to any pilot activity, and the STAP wishes to re-emphasize this point because it was made during the consultations.

There should also be consultation between the authors of the upcoming STAP and GEF Sec papers on Knowledge Management in the GEF to help organize this area of the IAP. In addition, consultation with the Knowledge Management mechanisms as proposed in the other IAPs should be encouraged.

(iv) Program Structure

STAP stand ready to contribute to the development of this IAP, and welcomes a dialogue with the lead agency in this regard.

Number of Pilot Cities

Early consultations for the IAP initially indicated an expectation of anywhere in the region of 5-10 pilots. It is therefore somewhat surprising to see 23 pilot cities proposed. As part of its standard screening approach to assess incremental reasoning, the STAP did a preliminary assessment of the various city sizes involved. They range from populations of 250,000 (La Paz) to ~20 million (Beijing) (see breakdown below).

Overview of the Cities IAP pilot cities

Child Project	Number of Pilot Cities	Agency	IAP Set-Aside Funding (million)	Proposed Cities and Population sizes
---------------	------------------------	--------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Child Project:- Brazil

Number of Pilot Cities: 2

Agency:- UNEP

IAP Set-Aside Funding (million): \$5

Proposed Cities and Population sizes: Recife Metropolitan area (3,743,854, with 1,555,039 in the city proper as of 2012); Brasilia (fastest growing Brazilian city with 2,852,372 people)

Child Project: China

Number of Pilot Cities:7

Agency:- World Bank

IAP Set-Aside Funding (million): \$10

Proposed Cities and Population sizes: Guiyang (approx 4.3 million), Shenzhen (15 million), Ningbo (7.6 million in the municipality with 3.5 million living in the metro area proper), Nanchang (4-5 million), Beijing (20+million), Tianjin (12+ million), Shijiazhuang (10 million)

Child Project: Cote d'Ivoire

Number of pilot cities: 1

Agency: AfDB/UNIDO

IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions): \$3

Proposed Cities and Population sizes: Abidjan (4 million)

Child Project: India

Number of pilot cities: 4

Agency: TBD

IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions):\$3.5

Proposed Cities and Population sizes: Vijayawada-Guntur (2-3 million), Mysore (approx 900,000), Jaipur (2+ million), Bhopal (around 2.4 million)

IAP Set-Aside Funding:

Child Project:Malaysia
Number of pilot cities: 1
Agency: ADB
IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions):\$1
Proposed Cities and Population sizes:1 unnamed city

Child Project: Mexico
Number of pilot cities:3
Agency: IDB
IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions):\$5
Proposed Cities and Population sizes: La Paz (250,000), Xalapa (approx 425,000) , Campeche (approx 850,000 but fast growing)

Child Project: Paraguay
Number of pilot cities:1
Agency: UNDP
IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions): \$2
Proposed Cities and Population sizes: Asuncion (metro area has 2 million with 542,000 living in the city proper)

Child Project:Peru
Number of pilot cities:1
Agency: IDB
IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions): \$3.5
Proposed Cities and Population sizes: Lima (8.473 million)

Child Project:Senegal
Number of pilot cities:1
Agency:World Bank \$4 Dakar (1.06 million)
South Africa 1 UNEP/DBSA
IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions): \$4
Proposed Cities and Population sizes:Johannesburg (3.2 million with 49% under age 34, and 42% under age 24...another youthful urban population)

Child Project:Vietnam
Number of pilot cities:1
Agency: ADB
IAP Set-Aside Funding (millions):\$4
Proposed Cities and Population sizes: an unnamed city

Total: 23 cities and \$45 million of set aside funding

Global Platform World Bank \$10

While STAP typically does not comment upon funding aspects of projects, it can raise questions related to incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline. Based on the PFD child project descriptors, as well as Table C of the PFD, it is clear that agencies have wisely targeted cities with ongoing urban sustainability initiatives and investment, and the co-financing arrangements appear robust. However, with each country averaging around \$2M per city from the IAP set-aside, even with the STAR country allocations it is uncertain if the GEF funding spread across 23 cities can trigger the incremental globally beneficial action of improving "the depth, breadth, and quality of local sustainability planning efforts and investment decisions,". For example, are resources sufficient to significantly develop resilience to future extreme events including climate change impacts?

The increase in number of pilots expected also further reconfirms the need for streamlined stakeholder engagement processes, indicator assessment and knowledge management.

Links to other IAPs

A review of child projects indicates potential opportunities for linkages with other IAPs (eg South Africa's Johannesburg project has a clear component for food (in)security). It would be useful to explore these possibilities for engagement in this case, as this could present interesting learning opportunities on urban-periurban-rural interactions. Other examples may exist in the portfolio.

(v) Miscellaneous

- 1) The Table C of the PFD makes it very difficult to assess the precise municipalities to be covered in each country, and therefore to align with the city names laid out in the text of the report. There are also several instances of acronyms used without explanations.
- 2) Section E of PFD : "Program's target contributions to GEBs".

The only relevant target shown is the mitigation of 106,669,069 metric tonnes of GHG emission reductions. There should be some clarification as to how this figure was reached, especially given the various emission factors that differ widely between each city's energy and electricity sources. Direct and indirect emissions are included. Was this estimate made using the old GEF definition for "indirect" which is under review?

For cities to be able to track their own GHG emissions will require a standard method offered as detailed guidelines if there is to be any real benefit from benchmarking and having a common baseline. For example, accounting for road/rail/air traffic passing through a city requires a common boundary to be used. STAP realizes that there has been much good work already done on identifying indicators, but questions whether it will be possible to produce a set of practical guidelines in time for practical use by the pilot cities as they begin their programmes.

- 3) Under the "Global Coordination and Knowledge-Sharing Platform" section, there are many activities listed. Acknowledging the short time line that the agency has had to outline potential activities, there should be attention paid to the planning, timelines and quantification of the human and other resource issues needed for enabling a city/municipality to participate actively and make a useful contribution. It is a very ambitious programme, covering 23 pilot cities, and as noted by the authors, continual turnover of local government officials (and of elected representatives) will make capacity building particularly challenging. Further, the 23 pilot cities outlined in the PFD have very different issues to cope with. This will add challenges to the services to be provided using the various joint activities as planned.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review

	<p>point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
--	--