



# GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT  
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

|   |  |                           |                          |
|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Project Title: Asunción Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability |  |                           |                          |
| Country(ies):   | Paraguay   | GEF Project ID:           | 9127                     |
| GEF Agency(ies):  | UNDP   | GEF Agency Project ID:    | 5188                     |
| Other Executing Partner(s):   | Environment Secretariat (SEAM)   | Submission Date:          | 13 Oct. 2016             |
| GEF Focal Area (s):   | Multi-focal Areas  | Project Duration (Months) | 60                       |
| Integrated Approach Pilot   | IAP-Cities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/> | Corporate Program: SGP    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Parent Program  | N/A  | Agency Fee (\$)           | 674,381                  |

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES

| Focal Area Objectives/Programs | Focal Area Outcomes  | Trust Fund | (in \$)               |              |
|--------------------------------|--|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
|                                |  |            | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| CCM-1 Program 1                | Promote innovation, technology transfer, and supportive policies and strategies.   | GEFTF      | 1,107,547             | 115,076,110  |
| CCM-2 Program 3                | Policy, planning and regulatory frameworks foster accelerated low GHG development and emissions mitigation   | GEFTF      | 1,107,547             | 115,076,109  |
| BD-1 Program 1                 | Improved management effectiveness of protected areas   | GEFTF      | 678,832               | 2,726,922    |
| BD-4 Program 9                 | Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management                                    | GEFTF      | 678,832               | 2,726,922    |
| CW-1 Program 2                 | Quantifiable and verifiable tonnes of POPs eliminated or reduced   | GEFTF      | 2,110,500             | 1,963,384    |
| IAP-Sustainable Cities         | To promote integrated planning and investments related to urban sustainability that result in environmental, social and economic benefits at the local and global scale. | GEFTF      | 1,809,862             | 2,770,553    |
| <b>Total project costs</b>     |  |            | 7,493,120             | 240,340,000  |

### B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

| <b>Project Objective:</b> Improve the quality of life in Asuncion and deliver multiple benefits through the integration of transport and solid waste management and green infrastructure into a framework for a sustainable and resilient city |                |  |   |            |                       |                        |
|--|----------------|--|---|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Project Components/ Programs   | Financing Type | Project Outcomes   | Project Outputs   | Trust Fund | (in \$)               |                        |
|  |                |  |   |            | GEF Project Financing | Confirmed Co-financing |
| 1. Enabling framework for a green sustainable city   | TA             | Increased capacities for planning, implementing and monitoring sustainable and resilient urban growth delivers multiple health; social; and local, national and global environmental benefits through:<br><br>a) One (1) new partnership mechanism | 1.1 Asunción Metropolitan Area (AMA) Land Use Plan and Sustainable Development Plan covering multiple sectors<br><br>1.2 Sustainable city financial strategy for increased allocation of funds and sustainable investments in transport, solid waste management | GEFTF      | 2,549,521             | 3,963,200              |

|  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level (Asuncion Autonomous Planning Institute consolidated and functioning with work plans and budget)</p> <p>b) Two (2) dialogue and coordination platforms with public, private and civil society stakeholders functioning with work plans and budget, with at least 40% membership of either sex</p> <p>c) Improved capacity of SEAM, MOPC and Municipality of Asuncion to fulfill their mandates in sustainable city issues, measured through the UNDP Capacity Scorecard, with gender approach (target scores SEAM:2, MOPC: 1.6, Municipality: 2.5 out of a maximum score of 3)</p> <p>d) Improved institutional capacities in planning, implementation and monitoring of urban, resilient, adaptive and sustainable growth of 3 institutions measured through the Sustainable City Capacity Scorecard, with gender approach (to be developed in year 1)</p> <p>d) 30% of municipal budget allocated to infrastructure works for the development of a sustainable city (Municipality of Asuncion) over a baseline of 19%.</p> <p>e) 7,854 hectares with improved biodiversity conservation from infrastructure development restrictions through mainstreaming green corridor</p> | <p>and chemicals, and protected areas/green areas</p> <p>1.3 Institutional capacity development program for integrated urban planning</p> <p>1.4 Policy and regulatory adjustments to improve integrated urban planning</p> <p>1.5 Inter-institutional and inter-sectorial dialogue and participation mechanisms for integrated urban planning</p> <p>1.6 Disaster risk management plan and early warning mechanism for the AMA</p> <p>1.7 Monitoring and control system (MRV) for a sustainable city</p> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

|  |        |   |  |       |  |             |
|--|--------|---|--|-------|--|-------------|
|  |        | restrictions and finance into urban plans and transport environmental impact assessments <sup>1</sup> .   |  |       |  |             |
| 2.Sustainable and safe mobility and transport in metropolitan Asuncion | TA/INV | <p>255,100 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigated and sequestered from urban transport resulting from implementation of transport oriented development, including:</p> <p>a) 100 kilometers of dedicated urban bicycle paths constructed and maintained<sup>2</sup></p> <p>b) Eight (8) pilot traffic management measures implemented (e.g. parking charges and restrictions, temporal one-way street implementation, reversible lanes, traffic signs, and dedicated bus lanes in a major city street)</p> <p>c) 30 bus routes optimized to complement the BRT and including the construction of bus stop shelters for optimized passenger experience</p> <p>d) 20% of total estimated female users of optimized routes value that the new routes improve their use of time and feel safe</p> <p>e) 100 buses scrapped based on new vehicle emissions, maintenance and scrapping standards for public transport vehicles</p> | <p>2.1 Multi-modal transport measures for the AMA in line with the Metrobus project</p> <p>2.2 Traffic management measures to improve traffic management in the AMA</p> <p>2.3 Optimum bus routing and bus stop shelters to complement the Metrobus</p> <p>2.4 Standards for public transport vehicles' emissions, maintenance and scrapping</p> | GEFTF | <p>1,498,382</p> <p><i>Inv: 1,153,639</i><br/><i>TA: 344,743</i></p> | 224,395,900 |
| 3. Improved chemicals and waste management system                      | TA/INV | <p>13.2 gTEQ of UPOP emissions and 110 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduced through an improved chemicals and waste management system, comprising:</p>   | <p>3.1 Pilot project on adequate management of illegal dumpsites in the RBSMBA to reduce global impacts</p> <p>3.2 Pilot project on</p>  | GEFTF | <p>1,643,797</p> <p><i>Inv: 1,298,708</i><br/><i>TA: 345,089</i></p> | 4,400,000   |

<sup>1</sup> This area comprises: 3,565 has of green areas (protected areas, parks, plazas), 2,985 has of green areas in built-up areas (patios, backyards and empty lots) and 1,304 ha of water bodies (rivers, streams and lakes).

<sup>2</sup> 30 km will be constructed with GEF resources; 70 km through cofinancing

|  |        |  |   |       |  |           |
|--|--------|--|---|-------|--|-----------|
|  |        | <p>a) Ten (10) tons/day of better managed wastes through a pilot on collection and separation of municipal solid wastes</p> <p>b) Six (6) tons of materials recovered/ recycled/day through a pilot on recovery of the value contained in municipal solid wastes</p> <p>c) 50% increase in incomes of waste pickers incorporated into pilot waste management facility (at least 50% of workers are female) (USD 21-45/day over a baseline of USD 14-30/day)</p>  | <p>collection-separation of MSWs (10 ton/day) to recover value contained in wastes</p> <p>3.3 Pilot project on recycling (6 ton/day) to recover value contained in the MSWs</p>   |       |  |           |
| 4.Emplacing and Improving Protected Area and Urban Green Infrastructure Management | TA/INV | <p>Increase in visiting populations of 5 globally significant migratory bird species in Asuncion Bay: Buff-breasted Sandpiper (<i>Tryngites subruficollis</i>); American Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis dominica</i>); Lesser Yellowlegs (<i>Tringa flavipes</i>); White-rumped Sandpiper (<i>Calidris fuscicollis</i>); and Pectoral Sandpiper (<i>Calidris melanotos</i>) from 121 observed in 2015 to 7,000 by end of project, achieved through:</p> <p>a) Improved management effectiveness of 3 urban protected areas covering 541 ha (of which 300 ha are in the National Protected Area System) measured by the GEF/METT increase of baseline scores and targeted scores as follows: <i>Banco San Miguel and Bahia de Asuncion</i> Ecological Reserve: 31 to 80; <i>Parque Guasu Metropolitano</i>: 41 to 85; <i>Jardin Botanico y Zoologico de Asuncion</i>: 52 to 90</p> <p>b) Restoration of key nesting habitats in 40 hectares of the Asuncion Bay PA and improved PA management (see</p> | <p>4.1 Management plan of the <i>Banco San Miguel and Bahia de Asuncion</i> Reserve approved and under initial implementation</p> <p>4.2 Management plans for <i>Parque Guasu Metropolitano</i> and <i>Jardin Botanico de Asuncion</i></p> <p>4.3 Asuncion Green Corridor established for conservation of urban biodiversity and ecosystem services</p> | GEFTF | 1,208,674<br><i>Inv: 591,635</i><br><i>TA: 617,039</i> | 3,830,900 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>METT score) providing improved conservation for 28 species of Nearctic migratory birds and 47 species of southern South American migratory birds</p> <p>Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into sustainable urban planning and transport sectors improves management of urban green spaces and improves connectivity and flow of species across the urban landscape with a unique guild of species from 3 globally significant ecoregions (Atlantic Forest; Chaco and Cerrado) achieved through:</p> <p>a) establishing 5,793 hectares of native species Green Corridor along transport routes between key green areas<sup>3</sup> (refer to footnote)</p> <p>b) official recognition of this corridor in urban master plan and sector EIA guidance.</p> <p>c) managing the corridor under an ecosystem approach developed for the mosaic of ecosystems present in Asuncion (increase in management effectiveness to be measured through a tool for urban corridor management to be developed during implementation)</p> <p>d) 50% of users of green areas (at least 20% women) who are involved in the improvement of green areas, understand the links with quality of life and cultural richness and feel safe using such areas</p> |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

<sup>3</sup> The Proposed Green Corridor will comprise 40 core public PA and other green areas (parks, plazas) with surface areas greater than 0.5 hectares plus a buffer zone of 200 mts (2 blocks) around each core area.

|  |    |  |   |       |                  |                    |
|--|----|--|---|-------|------------------|--------------------|
| 5. Dissemination of Lessons-learned, monitoring & evaluation | TA | Project implemented and achieving results<br><br>One (1) mid-term review report and one (1) final evaluation report<br><br>Eight (8) publications on best practices and lessons learned (at least 1 on gender) | 5.1 Project M&E System established and generating periodic reports<br><br>5.2 Mid-term Review and Final Evaluation<br><br>5.3 Knowledge products, best practices and lessons learned published and disseminated | GEFTF | 235,931          | 550,000            |
| Subtotal   |    |  |   |       | 7,136,305        | 237,140,000        |
| Project Management Cost (PMC)                                |    |  |   | GEFTF | 356,815          | 3,200,000          |
| <b>Total project costs</b>                                   |    |  |   |       | <b>7,493,120</b> | <b>240,340,000</b> |

### C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

| Sources of Co-financing   | Name of Co-financier                  | Type of Cofinancing | Amount (\$)        |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Recipient Government      | Environment Secretariat (SEAM)        | Grants              | 2,848,600          |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 117,900            |
| Recipient Government      | Ministry of Public Works (MOPC)       | Grants              | 227,528,500        |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 307,000            |
| Recipient Government      | Municipality of Asuncion              | Grants              | 5,278,600          |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 1,473,000          |
| Recipient Government      | Technical Planning Secretariat (STP)  | Grants              | 1,318,600          |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 57,000             |
| Recipient Government      | National Emergency Secretariat (SEN)  | Grants              | 417,600            |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 57,000             |
| CSO                       | Paraguayan Sustainable Cities Network | Grants              | 258,600            |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 57,000             |
| CSO                       | Guyra Paraguay                        | Grants              | 213,600            |
|                           |                                       | In-kind             | 107,000            |
| GEF Agency                | UNDP                                  | Grants              | 300,000            |
| <b>Total Co-financing</b> |                                       |                     | <b>240,340,000</b> |

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

| GEF Agency                   | Trust Fund | Country Name/Global                             | Focal Area          | Programming of Funds | (in \$)                   |                             |                  |
|------------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
|                              |            |   |                     |                      | GEF Project Financing (a) | Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup> | Total (c)=a+b    |
| UNDP                         | GEFTF      | Global Sustainable Cities Incentive (set-aside) | IAP                 | IAP-Cities           | 1,809,862                 | 162,888                     | 1,972,751        |
| UNDP                         | GEFTF      | Paraguay  | Climate Change      | IAP-Cities           | 2,215,094                 | 199,358                     | 2,414,452        |
| UNDP                         | GEFTF      | Paraguay  | Biodiversity        | IAP-Cities           | 1,357,664                 | 122,190                     | 1,479,853        |
| UNDP                         | GEFTF      | Paraguay  | Chemical and Wastes | IAP-Cities           | 2,110,500                 | 189,945                     | 2,300,445        |
| <b>Total Grant Resources</b> |            |   |                     |                      | <b>7,493,120</b>          | <b>674,381</b>              | <b>8,167,501</b> |

## E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

| Corporate Results  | Replenishment Targets   | Project Targets             |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society           | Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares     | 7,854 hectares              |
| 4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path                              | 750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect) | 1,227,442 tCO <sub>2e</sub> |
| 3. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern | Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)                        | 13.2 gTEQ                   |

## F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D.

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF

#### A.1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. No changes to the project's objectives, intentions or scope were made since the Child Project stage. A fifth component has been added to address dissemination of lessons learned, and monitoring and evaluation separately for better management of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework and reporting purposes, and funds have been allocated to the new component, representing 3% of the total budget. Project indicators and targets have been fine tuned.

*Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:*

2. No changes from Child Project. Statistical data has been updated and the problems, root causes and barriers have been described in more detail. Please refer to Section II "Development Challenge", pages 5-11 of the GEF-UNDP project document.

*Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects:*

3. No major changes from Child Project. The project document identifies a wider range of partners that will be involved in project implementation and includes the baseline initiatives that will contribute to the project's results. Kindly refer to Section IV "Results and Partnerships", sub-section ii "Partnerships", Tables 1, 2 and 3 regarding partnerships with government partners, civil society and private sector partners (pages 44-50) of the GEF-UNDP project document.

*Proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of outcomes and components of the project:*

4. No changes in the proposed alternative scenario. The Child Project outcomes and outputs remain the same, and have been expanded to include a detailed description of their implementation. In addition to the GEF focal area strategies indicated in the Child Project, BD Objective 4/Program 9 “Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface” has been added to Table A above. Asuncion has a unique guild of bird species from three globally significant ecoregions (Atlantic Forest, Chaco and Cerrado). The project proposes the establishment of an urban green corridor comprising public (protected areas, parks and plazas) and private green areas (backyards, patios in built-up areas) to help improve the protection and facilitate the mobility of species from one area to another increasing genetic exchange, seed dispersal, flower pollination and gene flow between populations increasing the genetic variability and sustainability of species under conservation in the protected areas. This will be done through mainstreaming the green corridor into urban land use planning as well as the planning and regulation of urban infrastructure. It will be complementary to the proposed efforts to improve the management and financing of the urban protected areas under the originally proposed BD Objective 1/Program 1. Please refer to Section IV “Results and Partnerships” (pages 21-44) of the GEF-UNDP project document for further details.

*Incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and cofinancing:*

5. No changes from Child Project. Baseline projects as well as other contributions to the project’s baseline and co-financing are presented in detail in Section III “Results and Partnerships”, Tables 1, 2 and 3 (pages 44-50) and Section VIII “Financial Planning and Management”, Table 7 “Parallel Co-financing” (pages 79-81) of the GEF-UNDP Project document.

6. The total amount of co-financing committed in the Child Project remains the same. The contributions per co-financier have been fine-tuned. As can be deducted from Table 7 “Parallel Co-financing” (pages 79-81), significant investments will be made by the key relevant institutions in the four sectors covered by the project (urban planning, transport, solid wastes and chemicals, and biodiversity conservation). These investments will mainly be allocated to costs of staff assigned to project activities; office services (electricity, communication); maintenance and operation of vehicles & equipment; office supplies; development & maintenance of project information and MRV systems; construction of bicycle lanes; construction of the Bus Rapid Transit system, bus stop signs and shelters; procurement of new buses to renovate the public transport bus fleet; cost of land property where the pilot separation and recycling facilities will be established; tree nurseries; construction of information center; habitat restoration activities in the Asuncion Bay; GIS equipment and laboratory.

7. Considering significant cash/grant co-financing is being provided by the project’s partners, the project will be able to use GEF resources to address efforts in developing an enabling framework for a sustainable and resilient city that integrates transport and solid waste management and green infrastructure to improve the quality of life in the Asuncion Metropolitan Area and delivering global environmental benefits (reduction of GHG and UPOPs emissions, biodiversity conservation and maintenance of carbon stocks) through the provision of incremental funding, to add on to investments already being made by project partners. As such the project can be deemed as entirely incremental.

*Global environmental benefits (GEFTF):*

8. Global environmental benefits have been assessed in more detail. The project will provide the following benefits in terms of GHG emissions reductions: i) Transport sector: over the project’s duration 255,100 tCO<sub>2e</sub> (combined emissions reductions of bicycle lanes and the Bus Rapid Transit system) as well as air pollutants, and benefiting health and quality of life of the metropolitan population; ii) Solid waste management sector: 110 tCO<sub>2e</sub> over the project’s duration as a result of better solid waste management; and iii) Green infrastructure: 972,232 tCO<sub>2e</sub> of carbon stocks maintained over the project’s duration through establishment of the a green corridor comprising public (protected areas, parks and plazas), and private (patios and yards in built-up areas) green areas. In total, 1,227,442 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.

9. The project will implement three solid waste management pilots, which are expected to result in a total UPOPs release reduction of 13.2 g-TEQ. This benefit will be expanded through reducing POP containing materials that may be dumped in the landfills and may percolate to underground water or water bodies around the landfills. Furthermore,



improved waste management will accrue co-benefits for biodiversity through improving habitat conditions for migratory bird species in protected areas, and health through reducing problems with vermin and conditions for reproduction of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes.

10. The project will also help to revert the current low level of biodiversity in the Asuncion Bay (migratory bird species) so that they will eventually get back to 1% of the global population, as was the case before the area suffered the impacts of construction of the *Costanera* waterfront parkway. Over its duration, the project will help increase population levels of five (5) flagship bird species: Buff-breasted Sandpiper; American Golden Plover; Lesser Yellowlegs; White-rumped Sandpiper and Pectoral Sandpiper (*Calidris melanotos*) from current 121 individuals (sum of all individuals of the 5 species observed in the Asuncion Bay in 2015) to 7,000 individuals. In addition, the project will improve the management effectiveness of three protected areas: i) *Banco San Miguel* and *Bahia de Asuncion* Ecological Reserve (baseline score 31, target score 80); ii) *Parque Guasu Metropolitano* (baseline score: 41, target score: 85); and iii) *Jardin Botanico y Zoologico de Asuncion* (baseline score: 52, target score: 90).

#### *Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up:*

11. The project's innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up have been described in detail. Kindly refer to Section V "Feasibility" (pages 52-62) of the GEF-UNDP Project document.

## **A.2. Child Project**

12. The project has been organized into five outcomes: 1) Enabling framework for a green sustainable city enhances integrated urban planning of the Asuncion metropolitan area (AMA); 2) Sustainable mobility and transport in the AMA for reducing GHG emissions from urban transport; 3) Improved chemicals and waste management system for reducing emissions of UPOPs, GHGs and toxic chemicals; 4) Emplacing and improving Protected Area management; and 5) Dissemination of lessons-learned, monitoring & evaluation. All of these outcomes will contribute to the four Program Outcomes and therefore to overall program impact.

13. The project will contribute to Program Outcome A: Enhanced sustainable and resilient urban planning processes through Outcome 1, in particular: i) development of land use and sustainable development plans; ii) institutional capacity development on sustainable city issues; iii) dialogue and coordination mechanism; iv) mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in city planning; and v) policy and regulatory adjustments. Outcomes 2, 3 and 4 will implement on-the-ground measures to address the most critical problems of the transport, solid wastes and chemicals and biodiversity conservation to generate experiences and identify lessons that will contribute to develop the enabling framework under Outcome 1 and therefore improving and reinforcing the sustainable and resilient urban planning processes foreseen under Program Outcome A.

14. Project Outcome 1 will contribute to Program Outcome B: Enhanced capacity for measuring urban sustainability through developing an monitoring platform for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) to monitor local and global sustainable city indicators. Monitoring will include project relevant impact indicators (e.g. sustainable transport, solid waste management and chemicals, biodiversity, air quality, GHG emissions, water) as well as management efficiency indicators related to integrated planning, transparency and citizen participation.

15. Project Outcome 1 will also develop a sustainable city financial strategy that will explore mechanisms such as optimizing tax collection to increase municipal revenues and prioritizing investments in infrastructure, establishing the bases for urban payment for ecosystem services, promoting public-private partnerships to develop green infrastructure, and promoting Nationally Appropriated Mitigation Actions (NAMA) as a means to access new funding opportunities. These actions will contribute to Program Outcome C: Increased finance capacity for urban sustainability.

16. Project Outcomes will contribute to Program Outcome D: Enhanced partnerships for sustainable cities at local, national and global levels, through exchange of experiences and information dissemination to be undertaken through

the GPSC knowledge management strategies. This will be accomplished through knowledge transfer activities that support urban investments, peer to peer work, participation in working groups on specific issues, documentation and outreach activities promoted by the GPSC.

17. Project Outcome 5 will cross-cut all Program Outcomes through consolidation of lessons learned extracted throughout the course of the project's implementation in issues such as integrated urban planning, transport-oriented development; green corridors for urban sustainability and resilience; civil society and private sector participation for urban sustainability; solid waste management study cases; gender equity and urban sustainability. It will support in particular Program Outcome D through the dissemination of lessons-learned and experiences at national, and in collaboration with the GPSC at regional and global levels.

### A.3. Stakeholders.

Key stakeholders and how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project.

Are there civil society organizations included? (yes  /no )? and indigenous peoples (yes  /no )?

18. The project strategy is built upon the active participation of public, private and civil society partners. Responsibilities of these partners in the implementation of the project, as well as the initiatives supported by them in addressing the project's development challenges have been summarized in Tables 1, 2 and 3 on pages 44-50 of the of the GEF-UNDP project document. The project will involve Civil Society Organizations, private sector associations, waste pickers and recyclers, and local communities generating and segregating wastes at household level, as summarized in Table 4, page 50 of the GEF-UNDP project document.

### A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

- a) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes  /no )?;  
b) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes  /no )?; and  
c) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women           %, men           %)?

19. The gender analysis undertaken allows highlighting two issues. The first one is the weak institutional structure for gender mainstreaming at municipal level, where of the project partners only the Municipality of Asuncion has a Gender Unit within its Social Area; however, its staffs lack the capacities for a comprehensive approach to this subject. Municipalities currently lack urban land use and development plans mainstreaming gender issues, as well as capacities for analyzing budgets with a gender approach (e.g. how much is being invested in gender equality and specific aspects related to women). Participation of women in municipal governments is very low. Although the III Equal Opportunities Plan of the Ministry of Women includes a very comprehensive approach, in the 2015 municipal elections only one woman was elected as Mayor, and of the 265 Municipal Council seats, only 44 are occupied by women and of these only 18 are titular, while 26 are alternate. This means that only 13% of these women occupy a public decision making position; hence the need to promote citizenship building to increase access of women to these spaces. Participation and involvement of the population in the improvement of their quality of life is low, especially in terms of gender equality.

20. Based on the gender analysis, the project has developed a strategy that links the most important gaps identified in relation to its components, the country's reality in terms of equality and the Sustainable Development Goals. These gaps include: parity in decision-making spaces; improvement of women's incomes and livelihoods; a more safe and

efficient city for women; and access to, and control of resources. In accordance with the gender mainstreaming strategy: i) Each activity was analyzed to include the necessary elements to guarantee reducing the identified gaps and establishing affirmative actions when necessary; ii) Specific activities have been included addressing the empowerment of women (capacities, economic empowerment and access to planning processes); iii) Indicators have been included at outcome level to contribute to measure progress in this field and which will be monitored as part of the M&E process; iv) A budget has been included to guarantee the measures and actions to be undertaken; and v) Improving the capacities of the project team to manage gender mainstreaming has been considered.

21. The project will mainstream gender equality through a number of strategies. At institutional level: political and technical dialogue to ensure the participation of women in the development of urban land use and sustainable development plans and multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms; ii) specific training to build the capacities of public institutions for mainstreaming gender in institutional processes (e.g. gender sensitive budgets, generation of gender disaggregated data); iii) promoting participation and involvement of women in project activities (e.g. training activities); iv) developing actions to promote masculinities in institutions; and v) awareness raising on gender issues in the private sector.

22. In transport related project activities: i) generating sex-disaggregated data for traffic related information that will serve as inputs for traffic management measures; ii) measures to facilitate a more efficient use of transport by women, such as access to key places for them (e.g. schools, health centers); and iii) safety measures to reduce gender based violence in public transport.

23. In solid waste and chemicals management activities: pilot interventions will generate formal employment for 50 waste pickers (mainly women) thus setting example on safeguarding livelihoods, legitimizing informal workers, improving their working conditions and generating financial gains for these beneficiaries. Gender mainstreaming will be undertaken through identifying the positive measures that are needed to ensure the participation of female waste pickers and improving their livelihoods, such as: i) facilitating access to children to educational or care-taking centers while the mothers are working; ii) training with the participation of spouses on masculinities, sexual and reproductive rights and economic empowerment; and iii) advice on access to municipal and national social programs. In addition, awareness raising activities to improve household waste management will benefit an important number of women in the community where the collection-separation-recycling pilots will be established.

24. In green areas/biodiversity conservation activities: i) facilitating access of women to green areas through a more efficient public transport system and ensuring safety through lighting, access and surveillance; ii) communication and awareness raising campaigns linking environmental conservation issues with traditional knowledge (e.g. use of plant species with medicinal purposes) through information materials, seminars and exhibitions in public spaces within the green corridor to be established by the project; and iii) generation of micro-enterprises for employment generation (e.g. urban tree nurseries managed by women with species adequate for the corridor, tour guides, bird watching initiatives).

25. The different gender mainstreaming strategies will generate a number of lessons that will be documented and shared with the relevant institutions and with the Ministry of Women so that it may promote replication of the strategies through their work with different national and sub-national institutions.

26. As can be seen in Section V “Project Results Framework”, pages 63-67 of the GEF-UNDP project document, the Results Framework is gender responsive and contains sex-disaggregated indicators. The share of women and men direct beneficiaries varies according to the activities. Percentages are indicated in the corresponding indicators.

## A.5 Risk

27. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

28. Kindly refer to Table 5 Risks on pages 54-58 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Coordinator will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. 5). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

## A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

### *Institutional arrangements:*

29. Please refer to Section VIII. Governance and Management Arrangements, pages 74-77 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for the institutional arrangements for project implementation.

### *Planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects:*

30. As part of the *Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP)* program, the project will coordinate with the Sustainable Cities Global Platform (GPSC) that will provide a range of support services to cities participating in the program (tools and metrics, sustainability planning support, knowledge management, targeted capacity building, financing sustainability, and global engagement facility). Further details on collaboration with the GPSC are included in the description of outputs in Section IV “Results and Partnerships”, Outcome 1 on pages 21-32 of the GEF-UNDP project document.

31. One of the development partners will act as place holder for delivering the building blocks and joint deliverables between the GPSC and the Paraguay project for the development of the Urban Sustainability Framework. The place holder shall be selected upon project start and as agreed between all development partners.

32. The project will coordinate the implementation of its components/products/activities with several other ongoing GEF projects led by the Environment Secretariat. Coordination will take place through meetings and exchange of information.

- GEF/UNDP #5471 “Capacity development for improved decision-making for the global environment”, which focuses on strengthening environmental information systems on the UN Environmental Conventions as a means to improve the environmental planning system and thus improving decision making processes. Both projects will coordinate in issues pertaining the development of information systems, MRV systems, environmental indicators, design of training programs, and inter-institutional coordination mechanisms within Asuncion and metropolitan area.
- GEF/UNDP #5465 “National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan”, which includes a specific area of work on urban biodiversity. Coordination will be sought to ensure contribution of the IAP Project to national targets within the Aichi framework.
- GEF/UNDP #5475 “Third National Communication on Climate Change”, which includes the preparation of a GHG inventory and other climate change related information. Both projects will exchange information generated in relation to the transport sector, which is a priority sector within the Third National Communication and IAP project.

- GEF/UNDP #4860 “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management into production practices in all bioregions and biomes”. This project is supporting the revision of the legal framework (including regulations on payment for ecosystem services in rural areas). The information produced may provide inputs to the IAP project for the development of urban payment for ecosystems services mechanisms. This project is also supporting the establishment and functioning of multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms for commodities. The experience acquired in this process will be useful to the IAP project in promoting urban dialogue platforms for sustainable city issues.
- GEF/UNIDO #9357 “Strengthening the environmentally-sound management and final disposal of PCBs in Paraguay”, which seeks to protect human health and the environment through management and disposal of PCB-containing equipment and wastes. The IAP project will undertake a baseline assessment of hazardous wastes, develop regulations for managing hazardous wastes, will promote an inter-municipal agreement for solid waste management, and will prepare technical guidelines for management and inspection of hazardous wastes (main wastes considered are POPs, Mercury and biological infectious wastes). These actions may provide a framework for an improved implementation of the UNIDO Project.
- GEF/UNEP #5879 “Development of Minamata Initial Assessment in LAC”, which seeks ratification and early implementation of the Minamata Convention is facilitated by the use of scientific and technical knowledge and tools by national stakeholders in participating countries. Both projects will exchange information generated. The baseline assessment on hazardous wastes to be prepared by the IAP project will provide useful information to the UNEP project. The UNEP project will develop tools and build capacities that will reinforce activities under the IAP project.

33. The project will coordinate with the following multi-lateral initiatives:

- IDB Loan PR-L1044 “Downtown Redevelopment, Modernization Metropolitan Public Transport, Government Offices” has the overall objective of increasing the quality of life of the population through rehabilitating and improving the urban and transport infrastructure. The key components of this program are the downtown redevelopment and government offices, which primarily addresses the construction of new government offices as well as several public spaces in Asunción’s historical center; and the transport component, which finances the implementation of the Metrobus. The historical center is part of the proposed Asunción Green Corridor; therefore the proposed improvements in public spaces to be undertaken by this program will be framed within the corridor proposal, and will be incorporated in the corridor’s action plan. The proposed GEF interventions under Outcome 2 build upon the transport component of this program, which also constitutes the cofinancing for this Outcome.
- IDB Loan PR-L1029 “Integrated Sanitation Program of Asunción”, which seeks to improve sanitation infrastructure for rehabilitation and expansion of sewerage of basins that drain to the Asunción Bay; construct a wastewater treatment plant and indoor plumbing for the low-income population of the area; and develop a comprehensive management plan for the basin of the Asunción Bay. This program will help reduce the flow of contaminants from the wider urban area around the Asunción Bay, where the *Banco San Miguel* and *Bahia de Asunción* Ecological Reserve (RBSMBA) is located. This will strengthen the efforts and impact of the GEF intervention in the RBSMBA (e.g. cleanup of the RBSMBA, restoration of habitats for migratory species, development of infrastructure for visitors and tourism) in the medium and long term. The RBSMBA management plan to be finalized through the GEF project will be linked to the wider management plan of the Asunción Bay basin to be developed by this program. Additionally, the program will provide cofinancing for implementation of the RBSMBA management plan

34. For an overview of the planned coordination with other initiatives being undertaken at national level, kindly refer to Tables 1, 2 and 3, pages 44-50 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document, under the heading “Other on-going initiatives/baseline projects, which contribute towards the project’s results”.

## **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT WELL ELABORATED AT PIF STAGE:**

### **A.7 Benefits**

35. The project will implement on-the-ground pilot interventions in the transport, solid waste and chemicals, and green areas/biodiversity sectors that will deliver socioeconomic benefits at national and local levels. Within the transport sector (Outcome 2) the project interventions will contribute to reduce the use of fossil fuels in public transport; reduce travel times within the city; strengthen a citizenship culture; and employment generation (e.g. bicycle rental).

36. In the solid wastes and chemicals sector (Outcome 3), several project interventions will contribute to generate employment. It will establish a cleanup brigade in the *Banco San Miguel* and *Bahia de Asuncion* Ecological Reserve, employing 30 informal waste pickers (mainly female) that will be responsible for cleanup of critical or representative areas of the reserve as well as surveillance to prevent future dumping of wastes in the reserve. The project will develop a web based system for exchange of materials recovered during waste separation activities, which will comprise providing information on-line about the composition and amounts of available waste materials with economic value, such as cardboard and paper, plastic, metals, tires and e-waste, directly to the recyclers or final users and to potential generators as well. This will support the improvement of markets through elimination of small and large intermediaries, which normally take most of the value of recovered materials and products derived from wastes and improving incomes for informal waste pickers. The collection-separation pilot will incorporate 10 informal waste pickers as permanent staff of the separation facilities, with an expected ratio of at least 50% - but preferably 80% women. The recycling pilot will incorporate another group of 10 informal waste pickers as permanent staff of the separation facilities, with at least 50% women. Over the project's duration a 50% increase in incomes of these waste pickers is expected, from a current USD14-30/day to USD21-45/day). These experiences will help setting example on safeguarding livelihoods, legitimizing informal workers, improving their working conditions and generating financial gains for these beneficiaries.

37. Within the green areas and biodiversity sector (Outcome 4), the project will strengthen the *Banco San Miguel* and *Bahia de Asuncion* Ecological Reserve, including the hiring of 15 park rangers by the Environment Secretariat and the Municipality of Asuncion, taking into account gender equality and social inclusion considerations (e.g. prioritizing employment of youths in poverty situation who live in the areas surrounding the reserve). The project will also support developing of financial and business plans for the *Banco San Miguel* and *Bahia de Asuncion* Ecological Reserve, the Asuncion Botanical Garden and Zoo, and the *Parque Guasu Metropolitano*. These plans will include identifying business opportunities and generation of micro-enterprises, especially for women (e.g. training to work as guides in bird watching initiatives, tour guides, urban tree nurseries).

### **A.8 Knowledge Management**

38. Project Outcome 5 "Dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring & evaluation", includes a specific output addressing publication and dissemination of knowledge products, best practices and lesson learned. The project will publish eight (8) urban sustainability booklets systematizing project experiences, best practices and lessons learned, both, printed and on-line. These booklets will approach different themes covering urban sustainability. Specific themes will be selected during project implementation, but may cover aspects such as: human development in the urban context; transport-oriented development; green corridors for urban sustainability and resilience; civil society and private sector participation for urban sustainability; solid waste management study cases; gender equity and urban sustainability, among others. These publications will be disseminated through specific presentation events and will be posted on project's and institutional websites.

39. The project envisages several knowledge management strategies under its different outcomes. A number of publications are foreseen, including: urban land use and sustainable development plans (Outcome 1); a guide for inspection and management of hazardous wastes (Outcome 3); protected area management plans; a field guide to the Asuncion birds; technical guidelines for green corridor management; guidelines for determining tree species and species mixes to promote and guide tree planting by institutions and individuals within Asuncion and metropolitan area; environmental education manual (Outcome 4). These publications will be disseminated in printed form, and through information materials, project and partners' institutional websites, and workshops.

40. Training will be undertaken to build the institutional and stakeholder capacities from the public, private and civil society sectors for mainstreaming integrated urban planning in institutional planning processes and to enable them to implement, monitor and evaluate sustainable city plans (Outcome 1) as well as targeted training addressing the on-the-ground interventions in transport, solid wastes and chemicals, and green areas and biodiversity sectors (Outcomes 2-4). Training will be undertaken through workshops, courses, and exchange of experiences. Training materials will be made available through the project's and partners' websites.

41. The project will support the development of several web-based information systems and platforms that will facilitate access to information and knowledge on sustainable city issues. These include a Sustainable City Information and Knowledge system that will systematize data and information on ongoing and planned initiatives on transport, solid wastes and chemicals, green areas and biodiversity; and the Paraguay Sustainable Cities Platform to monitor sustainable city indicators (Outcome 1); and a traffic information platform to help generate traffic management strategies (Outcome 2).

42. All project knowledge products will be shared with the platform of municipal development councils to be established with project support, and through this platform with the different municipal development councils within the Asuncion metropolitan area, which comprise public, private and civil society stakeholders, thereby reaching an important number of institutions in each sector. Furthermore, gender mainstreaming strategies will generate a number of lessons that will be documented and shared with the relevant institutions and with the Ministry of Women so that it may uptake such strategies and disseminate them through their work with different national and sub-national institutions.

43. Exchange of experiences and information dissemination will be undertaken through the GPSC knowledge management strategies, which will enable sharing the experiences and lessons generated by other participating cities as well as the experiences and lessons generated by this project with the different cities and institutions involved in implementation of the Sustainable Cities IAP. This will be accomplished through knowledge transfer activities that support urban investments, peer to peer work, participation in working groups on specific issues, documentation and outreach activities promoted by GPSC .

## **B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:**

### **B.1 Consistency with National Priorities.**

44. The project is aligned with the National Development Plan 2030. The plan proposes actions at public and private levels to reduce poverty, increase social development, promote inclusive economic growth and integrate Paraguay as a world actor by 2030. In particular, it is aligned with the following strategies: i) Promote local development through articulating government levels and communities for coordination, programming and delivery of public services, which seeks to strengthen municipal social capital in leading municipal planning, coordination and monitoring of actions within their territories; ii) Juridical security and development of an open, transparent and efficient government for competitiveness and innovation, which includes improving the transport network; iii) Promote the environment as an economic asset and cultural heritage within the framework of a sustainable economy, which includes strengthening renewable energy, reforestation and sustainable management of urban and industrial wastes; iv)

Risk management for climate change mitigation and adaptation, management of trans-border ecosystems and response to emergencies.

45. The project is consistent with the National Environmental Policy and the National Climate Change Policy. The former has the objective of conserving and sustainably managing the natural and cultural heritage of Paraguay to ensure sustainable development, equitable sharing of benefits, environmental justice and quality of life. The project is in line with several of its specific objectives, namely: i) Improve the well-being and quality of life; ii) Prevent environmental degradation, restore degraded ecosystems, mitigate and compensate environmental impacts on people and ecosystems; iii) Promote conservation and sustainable use of water, air, soil and biodiversity; iv) Actively involve citizens in environmental management and decision making; and v) Promote awareness raising on conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. The latter seeks to promote the implementation of coordinated actions by all sectors to reduce the adverse impacts of climate change in line with the national development objectives and comprises the following strategic pillars: i) Strengthening of institutional capacities to provide adequate response to managing climate change; ii) Financing, to identify and raise funds to face the impacts of climate change, including for biodiversity conservation, clean production, infrastructure and transport sectors; iii) Education, communication and participation, to improve understanding of climate change at national level; and iv) Knowledge and technology management, including risk management.

46. The project is coherent with the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy, which seeks to mainstream risk reduction and management in the national and sub-national government as well as civil society and communities. The policy comprises four strategic pillars: i) Strengthening of institutional capacities; ii) Financing; iii) Education, communication and citizen participation; and iv) Management of knowledge and technology.

47. The project is also consistent with several transport sector plans under the Ministry of Public Works. The Transport Master Plan seeks to establish a long term planning framework supporting the allocation of resources and investments in the transport sector for developing infrastructure and improving transport and logistical services. It comprises three main components: i) multi-modal transport emphasizing in integrating the transport network through inter-modal modalities; ii) quality and efficiency of transport services; and iii) analysis of logistical chains, namely freight transport. The National Logistics Plan has the objective of improving the country's competitiveness through promoting the development of logistics, services and infrastructure; and includes several projects in Asuncion such as a central highway, port logistics area, and urban distribution centers. The Bus Modernization Plan has the objective of rehabilitating and improving urban and transport infrastructure, through revitalizing the downtown area of Asuncion, including walkways and bicycle lanes, renovation of parks, construction of storm drains and sewerage; and the gradual establishment of an integrated transport system. The Metropolitan Asuncion Strategic Plan presents a framework for modernization of public transport in Asuncion and its metropolitan region, with the objectives of establishing the foundation for a long term integrated intervention in the transport sector, defining the desirable future development model; and formulating strategies to advance toward the proposed model.

48. The project is in line with the National Culture Secretariat's Asuncion Historical Center Master Plan, which seeks to revitalize Asuncion's historical, focusing in social and cultural aspects, including construction of museums, walking tours and revitalization of downtown plazas, as well as environmental through implementing a management plan for the Asuncion Bay to connect the city with the river and its natural surroundings and to recover the environmental quality of the historical center and riverside.

49. The project is coherent with the National Tourism Secretariat's Sustainable Development of the Tourism Sector Master Plan which seeks to position Paraguay at international level through several thematic areas, namely: i) Nature: variety of ecosystems and the power of water; ii) Traditional culture and the Guaraní world; and iii) Permanent dialogue with the rural lifestyle. The plan comprises a number of programs of which the tourist products programs is related to the project and in the case of Asuncion includes promoting tourism in relation to the historical center and the Paraguay River (Asuncion Bay and green corridor).

50. The project is aligned with several programs under the Good Government Program of the Municipality of Asuncion, in particular: i) Institutional strengthening and administrative transparency; ii) land use and urban planning;



iii) Asuncion Autonomous Institute for Planning; iv) Eco-sustainable Asuncion (solid waste management, green areas management, water resources management, environmental management); and v) Improvement of traffic and public transport.

51. The project is in line with Emerging and Sustainable Cities Initiative Action Plan supported by the Inter-American Development Bank, and will contribute to its implementation. The action plan identifies, organizes and prioritizes urban interventions in Asuncion and metropolitan area toward sustainable growth based on three pillars: i) Environmental and climate change sustainability; ii) Urban sustainability; and iii) Fiscal sustainability and governance.

52. The project is also in line with the Environment Secretariat's Municipal Solid Waste Integrated Management Master Plan, which seeks to strengthen the institutional and operational capacities for solid waste management. It comprises improving solid waste management; improving the legal, institutional and social framework for implementing the master plan; promoting incentives to stimulate source reduction, reuse and recycling; source segregation; developing infrastructure for solid waste management; and closing and remediation of informal dumpsites.

53. The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) is currently under revision to incorporate the AICHI targets (to be finalized in 2016). The project will contribute to the achievement of several national targets associated with Aichi targets: For target 3, that relates to incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, this project will contribute to increasing the role of municipalities in strategies such as mainstreaming payment for ecosystem services, and public-private partnerships to promote green infrastructure. For target 11 that relate to the per cent area of terrestrial and inland water under conservation, a proposed green corridor comprising public and private green areas will contribute to reaching national targets. For target 12: related to the prevention of extinction of threatened species, awareness raising campaigns managed by city authorities along with NGOs will raise critical attention and funds and provide technical assistance for the conservation of threatened species of global significance (e.g. the Buff-breasted Sandpiper (*Tryngites subruficolis*) of which at least 3% of the global population of this species used the Asuncion Bay habitat for roosting and feeding during migration).

54. The project has strong links with the Third National Communication to the UNFCCC under development. The Second National Communication had identified priority mitigation actions such as the increase in renewable energy use, the improvement in energy efficiency and the energy system –specially in the transport sector- and the optimization of the transport system in Asunción and its Metropolitan area in order to decrease GHG. In the Third National Communication, these priority actions will be further developed, specifically through the following components: 1) GHG inventory for the energy and waste sectors; 2) the Biennial Update Report section on the analysis of mitigation actions; 3) the National Adaptation Plan, which will include an vulnerability análisis in the hydric resources and public health as well as work on issues such as adaptation to extreme events, monitoring, research, technological solutions and data management in general.

55. The project is also in line with the NIP for the Stockholm Convention (signed by Paraguay in May, 2001 and ratified by the Law 2.333 of January 6th, 2004). The Paraguay NIP, 2007, assesses 12 initial POPs and Dioxins and Furans releases with the baseline year of 2005. It concludes that inappropriate management and activities associated to uncontrolled open air burning processes and waste incineration were generating significant emissions and identified as a national priority the reduction of releases of Dioxins and Furans.

56. The project falls under the UNDAF Outcomes 1.1 *Paraguay will have progressed in protecting and guaranteeing the rights of all individuals, with emphasis on vulnerable and discriminated populations*; 2.1: *Devolution and accountability: Paraguay will have reduced poverty levels, established decent work and guaranteed improvement of working population's income*; and 3.1: *Paraguay will have reduced its disaster risks and increased community resilience and responsiveness to emergencies and disasters*.

57. Furthermore, the project is consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular SDG Goal 11 *Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable* and its targets 11.2 *by 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by*

expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons; 11.3 by 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries; 11.4 strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage; 11.6 by 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management; and 11.7 by 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

### C. BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

| GEF M&E requirements   | Primary responsibility  | Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>4</sup> (US\$) |              | Time frame   |
|--|---|--|--------------|--|
|  |   | GEF grant  | Co-financing |  |
| Inception Workshop   | UNDP Country Office   | USD 11,000   | USD 25,663   | Within two months of project document signature        |
| Inception Report   | Project Coordinator   | None   | None         | Within two weeks of inception workshop                 |
| Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP             | UNDP Country Office   | None   | None         | Quarterly, annually                                    |
| Monitoring of indicators in project results framework  | Project Coordinator   | Per year: USD 4,000 (USD 20,000)   | USD 46,663   | Annually   |
| GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)  | Project Coordinator and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team | None   | None         | Annually   |
| NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies   | UNDP Country Office   | Per year: USD 2,000 (USD10,000)  | USD 23,330   | Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies |
| Lessons learned and knowledge generation   | Project Coordinator   | None   | None         | Annually   |
| Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant | Project Coordinator<br>UNDP CO                                | None   | None         | On-going   |
| Addressing environmental and social grievances   | Project Coordinator<br>UNDP Country Office<br>BPPS as needed  | None for time of project coordinator, and UNDP CO                        | None         |  |
| Project Board meetings and annual planning workshops   | Project Board<br>UNDP Country Office<br>Project Coordinator   | Per year: USD 2,000 (USD 10,000)   | USD 23,330   | At minimum annually                                    |
| Supervision missions   | UNDP Country Office   | None <sup>5</sup>  | USD 10,000   | Annually   |
| Oversight missions   | UNDP-GEF team   | None <sup>5</sup>  | USD 10,000   | Troubleshooting as needed                              |
| Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 4  | Project Coordinator   | 1% of GEF grant  | USD 164,814  | On-going   |

<sup>4</sup> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.


<sup>5</sup> The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

| GEF M&E requirements  | Primary responsibility  | Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>4</sup> (US\$) |                    | Time frame                                       |
|---|---|--|--------------------|--|
|   |   | GEF grant  | Co-financing       |  |
|   |   | USD 74,931   |                    |  |
| GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits   | UNDP Country Office and Project Coordinator and UNDP-GEF team                                   | None   |                    | To be determined.                                |
| Independent Mid-term Review (MTR), management response and Mid-term Tracking Tool                                     | UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team (International and national consultants) | USD 45,000   | USD 104,650        | Between 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR. |
| Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, management response and Terminal Tracking Tool | UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team (International and national consultants) | USD 60,000   | USD 129,900        | At least three months before operational closure |
| Translation of MTR and TE reports into English  | UNDP Country Office   | USD 5,000  | USD 11,650         |  |
| <b>TOTAL indicative COST</b><br>Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses                 |   | <b>USD 235,931</b>   | <b>USD 550,000</b> |  |

**PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>6</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

| <b>Agency Coordinator,<br/>Agency Name</b>           | <b>Signature</b>  | <b>Date<br/>(MM/dd/yyyy)</b> | <b>Project Contact Person</b>  | <b>Telephone</b>   | <b>Email Address</b>   |
|--|---|------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Adriana Dinu<br>UNDP-GEF<br>Executive<br>Coordinator |  | Oct. 13, 2016                | Carlos<br>Andres<br>Hernandez,<br>Programme<br>Analyst<br>Montreal<br>Protocol | (507) 302-<br>4574 | <a href="mailto:Carlosandres.hernandez@undp.org">Carlosandres.hernandez@undp.org</a> |

<sup>6</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTE, LDCE, and SCCF

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

**This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):**

Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.

**This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:**

Outcome 1.1: Paraguay will have progressed in protecting and guaranteeing the rights of all individuals, with emphasis on vulnerable and discriminated populations

Outcome 2.1: Devolution and accountability: Paraguay will have reduced poverty levels, established decent work and guaranteed improvement of working population's income

Outcome 3.1: Paraguay will have reduced its disaster risks and increased community resilience and responsiveness to emergencies and disasters.

Outcome 3.2: Paraguay will have achieved significant progress in reducing deforestation and desertification, in best practices of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and in climate change mitigation and adaptation.

**This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**

Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.

|   | Objective and Outcome Indicators  | Baseline | Mid-term Target   | End of Project Target  | Assumptions  |
|---|---|----------|---|--|--|
| <b>Project Objective:</b><br><br>Improve the quality of life in the Asuncion Metropolitan Area (AMA) and deliver multiple benefits through the integration of transport and solid waste management and green infrastructure into a framework for a sustainable and resilient city | Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level. | 0        | 1<br><br>(Asuncion Autonomous Planning Institute established)   | 1<br><br>(Asuncion Autonomous Planning Institute consolidated and functioning with work plans and budget)  | Political will to develop partnership mechanisms in association with different sectors and allocation of financial, technical and administrative resources for sustainability of results.  |
|   | Number of direct participation structures of civil society, disaggregated by sex, in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically <sup>7</sup>                   | 0        | 1<br><br>(Platform of AMA Municipal Development Councils with public, private and civil society stakeholders established, with at least 40% membership of either sex) | 1<br><br>(Platform of AMA Municipal Development Councils with public, private and civil society stakeholders functioning with work plans and budget, with at least | Political will to incorporate key stakeholders with emphasis in civil society to participate in urban planning, implementation and monitoring processes. Interested private and civil society sector parties willing to engage with public sector in citizenship participation processes with gender sensitive approaches. |

<sup>7</sup> This is indicator 11.3.2, Target 11.3 of SDG Goal 11 and is used as a more specific indicator than the most appropriate one in the IRFF

|   |  |   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
|   |  |   |  | 40% membership of either sex)   |  |
|   | Quantity of GHG emissions mitigated and sequestered through transport oriented development, green infrastructure and solid waste management policy uptake (tons of CO2e)   | Transport: 0<br>Solid Waste: 0<br>Green Infrastructure: 972,232<br>Total: 972,232   | Transport: 45,500 (bicycle paths)<br>Solid Waste: 55<br>Green Infrastructure: 972,232 (carbon stock maintained)<br>Total: 1,017,787              | Transport: 255,100 (bicycle paths and BRT)<br>Solid Waste: 110<br>Green Infrastructure: 972,232 (carbon stock maintained)<br>Total: 1,227,442     | Participating national and municipal institutions and private sector are willing to make the required investments for adequate implementation of GHG emissions reductions.   |
|   | Quantity of UPOP emissions reduced through an integrated waste and chemical management system (gTEQ)   | 132.53 (due to uncontrolled combustion and landfills)   | 6.6  | 13.2  | Participating national and municipal institutions and private sector are willing to make the required investments for adequate implementation of UPOP emissions reductions.  |
|   | Increase in 1% of global populations (number of individuals) of 5 species found seasonally at site: Buff-breasted Sandpiper ( <i>Tryngites subruficollis</i> ); American Golden Plover ( <i>Pluvialis dominica</i> ); Lesser Yellowlegs ( <i>Tringa flavipes</i> ); White-rumped Sandpiper ( <i>Calidris fuscicollis</i> ); and Pectoral Sandpiper ( <i>Calidris melanotos</i> ) | Buff-breasted Sandpiper: 7<br>American Golden Plover: 5<br>Lesser Yellowlegs: 2<br>White-rumped Sandpiper: 37<br>Pectoral Sandpiper: 70 | Buff-breasted Sandpiper: 350<br>American Golden Plover: 250<br>Lesser Yellowlegs: 150<br>White-rumped Sandpiper: 700<br>Pectoral Sandpiper: 1500 | Buff-breasted Sandpiper: 800<br>American Golden Plover: 600<br>Lesser Yellowlegs: 400<br>White-rumped Sandpiper: 1500<br>Pectoral Sandpiper: 3700 | Participating national and municipal institutions are willing to make the required investments for adequate implementation of biodiversity conservation measures.  |
| <b>Outcome 1</b><br>Enabling framework for a green sustainable city enhances integrated urban planning of the AMA | Level of capacity improvement of 3 institutions with mandates in sustainable city issues, measured through the UNDP Capacity Scorecard, with gender approach   | SEAM: 1.02<br>M.A.: 0.53<br>MOPC: 1.66<br>(maximum score: 3)  | SEAM: 1.60<br>M.A.: 1<br>MOPC: 2<br>(maximum score: 3)   | SEAM: 2<br>M.A.: 1.6<br>MOPC: 2.5<br>(maximum score: 3)   | The three institutions recognize the need to improve institutional processes, collaboration and cooperation to better fulfill their mandates and incorporating issues related to gender equality, social inclusion and vulnerable groups, and implement proposed improvements. |
|   | Level of improvement of institutional capacities in planning, implementation and monitoring of urban, resilient, adaptive and sustainable growth of 3 institutions   | Sustainable City Capacity Scorecard to be developed and   | Tbd in year 1  | Tbd in year 1   | The participating institutions recognize the need to improve institutional processes, collaboration and cooperation for  |

|  |   |  |                                      |  |   |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|  | measured through the Sustainable City Capacity Scorecard, with gender approach  | applied in project year 1  |                                      |  | sustainable and resilient urban planning incorporating issues related to gender equality, social inclusion and vulnerable groups, and implement proposed improvements.  |
|  | Percentage of increase of the municipal budget allocated to infrastructure works for the development of a sustainable city (Municipality of Asuncion)   | 19<br>(USD 27.3M of USD 143.6M in 2015)  | 25                                   | 30   | Municipality bodies (executive and legislative) are willing to jointly prioritize increased annual allocations for infrastructure works in the municipal budgets.   |
|  | Surface area (hectares) with improved biodiversity conservation from infrastructure development restrictions through mainstreaming green corridor restrictions and finance into urban plans and transport environmental impact assessments. | 7,854<br>(Infrastructure development restrictions not mainstreamed into urban plans and EIA to ensure biodiversity conservation) |                                      | 7,854<br><br>(Green areas, including green corridor, other green areas outside the corridor, and water bodies – rivers, streams and lakes; and finance mainstreamed into urban plans and transport EIA) <sup>8</sup> | SEAM, Municipality of Asuncion and MOPC incorporate the green areas/infrastructure into their institutional management; allocate resources (financial, technical and administrative) for adequate management; and enforce regulations |
| <b>Outcome 2</b><br><br>Sustainable and safe mobility and transport in metropolitan Asunción for reducing GHG emissions from urban transport | Number of urban passengers riding the alternative of low carbon BRT system - considering gender equality, time improvement and safety.  | 0 riders   | Maximum of 230,000 passenger per day | 240,000 passengers (baseline plus 2 years of growth a 2.2%)  | Design of routes takes into account differentiated uses of transport by gender, time efficiency and safety related issues.<br><br>By Project end, survey carried out accurately reflects overall quality improvement.                 |
|  | Number of kilometers of dedicated urban bicycle paths constructed and maintained  | 1  | 41                                   | 101  | MOPC and Municipality of Asuncion collaborate and coordinate the design,  |

<sup>8</sup> This area comprises: 3,565 has of green areas (protected areas, parks, plazas), 2,985 has of green areas in built-up areas (patios, backyards and empty lots) and 1,304 ha of water bodies (rivers, streams and lakes).

|  |  |               |                     |                      |   |
|--|--|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|
|  |  |               |                     |                      | construction and maintenance of bicycle paths.  |
|  | Number of pilot traffic management measures implemented (e.g. parking charges and restrictions, temporal one-way street implementation, reversible lanes, traffic signs, and dedicated bus lanes in a major city street) | 0             | 2                   | 8                    | STP, MOPC, SEAM and Municipality of Asuncion are willing to share the information generated by each institution and manage the implementation of pilot interventions in a coordinated manner.           |
|  | Number of bus routes optimized to complement the BRT and including the construction of bus stop shelters for optimized passenger experience  | 0             | 10                  | 30                   | MOPC and private sector are willing to coordinate and agree on the restructuring of bus routes. MOPC and Municipality of Asuncion coordinate the implementation of bus stop shelters.                   |
|  | Number of scrapped buses due to implementation of new vehicle emissions, maintenance and scrapping standards for public transport vehicles   | 0             | 50                  | 100                  | MOPC, BRT project, municipalities and private sector are willing to collaborate and agree on the buses that will be scrapped.   |
| <b>Outcome 3</b><br>Improved chemicals and waste management system for reducing emissions of UPOPs, GHGs and toxic chemicals | Number of tons/day of wastes managed through a pilot on collection and separation of MSW   | 0             | 5<br>(2% of total)  | 10<br>(10% of total) | Municipalities and workers are willing to coordinate in the implementation of MSW management measures.  |
|  | Number of tons of materials recovered/ recycled/day through a pilot on recovery of the value contained in MSW  | 0             | 3                   | 6                    | Municipalities and workers are willing to coordinate in the implementation of MSW management measures. Business plans demonstrate positive results for implementation of pilot recycling interventions. |
|  | Percentage of increase in incomes of waste pickers incorporated into pilot waste management facility (at least 50% of workers are female).   | USD 14-30/day | 20<br>(USD 16.8-36) | 50<br>(USD 21-45)    | Female waste pickers are willing to be incorporated in formal jobs and improve their livelihoods.   |



|  |  |   |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Outcome 4</b><br><br>Emplacing and improving Protected Area and Urban Green Infrastructure management | Level of improvement of management effectiveness score of 3 urban protected areas, measured by the GEF/METT  | BSMyBA: 31<br>Parque Guasu: 41<br>Jardin Botánico: 52 | BSMyBA: 65<br>Parque Guasu: 65<br>Jardin Botánico: 75   | BSMyBA: 80<br>Parque Guasu: 85<br>Jardin Botánico: 90  | SEAM, Municipality of Asuncion and MOPC are willing to build their capacities, collaborate and cooperate for protected area management. MOPC is willing to provide financial support to protected areas through its investments programs. Civil society is aware, takes care and gets involved in protected area management. |
|  | Number of hectares of green areas with improved management   | 5,770<br>(Green corridor not officially recognized)   | Management effectiveness tool to be defined as part of the establishment of the green corridor. | 5,793<br>(Green corridor 2 new linear parks including) is officially recognized; being managed under an ecosystem approach and incorporated into sector EIA guidance<br>An increase in management effectiveness. Target to be established once tool is available | SEAM, Municipality of Asuncion and MOPC incorporate the green corridor into their institutional management and coordinate allocation of resources (financial, technical and administrative) for adequate management. Civil society aware and participating in taking care of the green corridor.                             |
|  | Number of hectares of habitats in Bahia de Asuncion recovered and secured for 28 species of Nearctic migratory birds and 47 species of southern South American migratory birds | 0   | 20  | 40   | SEAM, Municipality of Asuncion, MOPC and other stakeholders coordinate actions to improve, restore and maintain habitats. Civil society involved in restoration activities and taking care of restored habitats.   |
|  | Number of persons using green areas (disaggregated by sex) who are involved in the improvement processes, understand the links with quality of life and cultural               | 0   | 30% of users (at least 20% women)   | 50% of users   | Civil society is involved in restoration activities and in taking care of habitats.  |

|   |  |  |         |                      |  |
|---|--|--|---------|----------------------|--|
|   | richness and feel safe   |  |         |                      |  |
| <b>Outcome 5</b><br>Dissemination of Lessons-learned, monitoring & evaluation | Level of project implementation and achievement of results (percentage of budgetary execution) |  | 65      | 100                  | Project partners have the political will to make progress toward a sustainable city, assume project ownership and ensure sustainability of results.                                    |
|   | Mid-term review report and final evaluation report   |  | 1 (MTR) | 1 (Final evaluation) | Findings from the MTR will be used to revise the project's progress and to establish the corrective measures to achieve project objectives.  |
|   | Number of publications on best practices and lessons learned (at least 1 on gender)            |  | 4       | 4                    | Project partners are open about project challenges and successes, as well as lessons-learned so these can be captured, published and disseminated at national and international level. |

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

**GEFSEC comments at CEO Endorsement Stage**

| Review Criteria | Questions   | GEFSEC comments   | Responses   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| Project Design  | 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | Overall, the project design is yet to demonstrate that integrated urban planning is a strategic process allowing cities to shape a vision, an overarching framework to bring together a multiplicity of actions and initiatives that will reinforce each other. For details, please see the following comments. |   |
|                 |   | <p>Baseline:<br/>1) Please list the drivers of urban land use in AMA.</p>   | <p>Drivers are physical (location of Asuncion along the Paraguay River), demographic (rural-urban migrations and settlements in the periphery of Asuncion, the river's flood plain and other lowlands and flood-prone areas), and economic (increasing land and property prices).</p> <p>Asuncion sits on the left bank of the Paraguay River. The presence of the river's meander has determined the growth of the city towards the East. The riverside has been traditionally occupied by port, logistical and industrial activities. Urbanization followed a lineal pattern along the main streets with economic development concentrated along these dynamic axes toward the East and with different models and activities in the different axes (e.g. services, logistics, businesses).</p> <p>Rural-urban migrations started gradually during the 1960s and increased significantly since the 1980s due to increasing rural poverty, being Asunción the main pole of attraction as a main center for services (health, education) and employment opportunities. The city and the surrounding municipalities expanded following a radio-centric pattern with very low global population density. New urbanizations (land partitions and plots) increased dispersed between the axes or following a perpendicular pattern to these. The interstitial spaces farther apart from the main communication axes, as well as the rivers' flood plain and other flood-prone areas were settled but have been at the margin of urban development lacking basic services, equipment and access to the city. Social housing developments are sparsely connected to the city.</p> <p>The increase in land and property prices, especially in Asuncion, pushes the middle and low-income families further away to the East to the surrounding municipalities and is related to the increase in the construction of high-rise buildings in former residential areas. Currently, population growth is concentrated in the second and third periphery of the AMA, following a spontaneous peri-urbanization phenomenon that drives big structural and physical changes in rural areas, with confronting land uses in these changing areas.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | GEFSEC comments  | Responses   |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
|                 |           | <p>2) Please map out the roles of the central government, departments and municipalities in urban planning and management.</p> | <p>This information has been included in the GEF-UNDP Project Document (see paragraphs 4-7).</p> <p>The roles are as follows:</p> <p><u>Central Government:</u> The Technical Planning Secretariat (STP) has the responsibilities, within the framework of the National Development Plan, of coordinating economic, social and cultural development with the municipalities, as well as organizing, regulating and managing information, guidelines, development planning, land use planning and public policies at national level. The STP elaborated guidelines for preparing municipal sustainable development plans and is currently systematizing the plans submitted by municipalities and checking alignment with the National Development Plan. It is also elaborating a guideline for preparing municipal land use and urban development plans, which will be launched in 2017. The Environment Secretariat (SEAM) is in charge of the National Environment Policy and promoting national and regional economic and social development plans ensuring sustainable use of natural resources as well as environmental land use plans. Within these responsibilities, SEAM may promote at municipal level the elaboration of land use plans ensuring their alignment with the National Environment Policy.</p> <p><u>Departmental Governments:</u> As intermediate level institutions, they must coordinate their actions with the municipalities and at the same time articulate municipalities with the central level. Departmental governments are responsible for: i) elaborating, approving and implementing policies, plans and programs for political, economic, social, tourism and cultural development; ii) Coordinating plans, programs and projects with the Municipalities in the Department and cooperate with them; iii) Organize in accordance with the Department's budget common services such as public works, water supply, transport and other services that affect more than one municipality within the Department in coordination with the municipalities and the regulatory framework.</p> <p><u>Municipalities:</u> Municipalities have the following roles: <u>In regards to planning and land use:</u> i) planning of the municipality territory through the Urban Land Use Plan and the Municipal Sustainable Development Plan; ii) demarcation of the urban and rural areas of the municipality; iii) regulating land use and occupation; iv) regulating land plotting; v) regulating the public and private construction regime; vi) regulating publicity in public places; vii) regulating for fire prevention and landslides; viii) defining street names and numbering of buildings; ix) establishment, maintenance and updating of municipal cadaster information. <u>In regards to public infrastructure and services:</u> i) construction, equipment, maintenance and cleaning of municipal public infrastructure, including streets, avenues, parks, plazas, and other public places; ii) construction and maintenance of storm drains; iii) supply of drinking water and sewers in accordance the law that regulates such services in case these services were not provided by other public institutions; iv) construction, equipment and maintenance of rural roads and other communication means not in charge of other public institutions; v) regulating</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | GEFSEC comments  | Responses  |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           |  | <p>and supply of waste management services; vi) regulating funerary and cemetery services; and vii) regulating, organization and management of supply centers, markets, slaughterhouses, municipal fairs and others. <u>In regards to public transport and traffic:</u> i) supply, regulating and control of public transport (passengers and loads); ii) regulating and controlling traffic in streets, avenues and other municipal roads, including safety and circulation of vehicles and pedestrians, and driving requirements. The control of the sections of national and international roads that cross a municipality will be exercised by the designated national authority; iii) regulating and controlling the status of vehicles taking into account public safety, hygiene and health, and pollution prevention. The National Transport Directorate (decentralized body responsible for regulating national and international transport) and the Viceministry of Transport (Ministry of Public Works) shall establish the minimum standards for authorizing and driving public transport buses. <u>In regards to environment:</u> i) preservation, conservation, restoration and improvement of significant natural resources; ii) regulating and control of standards and norms that guarantee the environmental quality of the municipality; iii) control of compliance of national environmental standards subject to an agreement with the competent national authorities; iv) establishing a local servitude regime and demarcating boundaries of rivers, lakes and streams.</p> |
|                 |           | <p>3) In the Context section, please provide info on AMA's existing and/or past urban development plans and explain what has worked and what has not.</p>  | <p>The Municipality of Asuncion prepared an urban regulatory plan in 1992 but it has not been fully respected and has not been updated in accordance with the changes experienced by the city since its approval. In 1994 an urban and environmental plan was elaborated but was approved only in 2000; it has been partially implemented and follow-up and monitoring has been insufficient to extract lessons. The municipality is currently working to transform this plan into a sustainable development plan. The other AMA municipalities have for the first time submitted urban development plans in 2016 to comply with the National Expenditures Budget Law for the 2016 fiscal year, which stipulates that municipalities must present their development plans as mandated by the Municipal Law in order to receive their budgetary allocations of royalties from the Itaipu and Yacyreta Bi-national Entities (hydroelectric dams). The information has been included in paragraph 20 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>  |
|                 |           | <p>Outcome 1:<br/>4) Please articulate how the proposed "Land Use Plans" will a) shape AMA's urban form or spatial distribution of urban activities in an efficient and inclusive way; and b) provide incentives to priorities investments in high potential areas and therefore mitigate the needs for urban sprawl with an objective to deliver global environmental benefits.</p> | <p>a) The proposed LUP will shape AMA's urban form or spatial distribution of urban activities in an efficient and inclusive way through hierarchization and prioritization of public interventions over key areas where the LUPs will be more accurate and detailed (through zoning orientations); taking into account and accompanying economic development by optimizing the land use of economic activities and developing long term strategies within a dialogue and agreement process; favoring connectivity with the most excluded areas; developing a global and voluntary policy as well as a specific methodology within AMA settlements; developing an articulated policy for public infrastructure and services between municipalities; managing legal assistance of the LUPs with flexible and practical instruments; linking the different problems within the AMA based on a systemic approach; and integrating a dynamic principle to ensure not remaining in a static and rigid process.</p>  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | GEFSEC comments  | Responses   |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
|                 |           |  | <p>b) LUPs may provide incentives to priority investments based on several types of actions: compact urban strengthening and development of urbanized areas; developing a voluntary public policy for land purchasing; optimized orientation of properties in developable areas; planning urban development in developable areas in phases to give enough time to equip the new areas; generating fiscal incentives for areas considered strategic; facilitating construction regulations (height, density, land use) in strategic areas; shortening mobilization distances by integrating employment areas and density principles; taking into account the value and protection of green areas (e.g. forbidding construction or under certain conditions) and hydrological networks; and integration of specific habitat, economic, environmental and mobility strategies in LUPs.</p> <p>This information has been included in paragraphs 66/67 of the GEF-UNDP Project document.</p> |
|                 |           | <p>5) In your approaches to financial sustainability, please include “land value capture” as an important mechanism. Properties around the BRT routes and the green corridor will see significant increase of economic value, which should be harvested for municipal development.</p> | <p>The mechanism has been included as requested. See paragraph 78 of the GEF-UNDP Project document.</p>   |
|                 |           | <p>Outcome 2: proposed “Land Use Plans” will guide the implementation of “Transport Master Plan.”</p>  | <p>6) P The land use plan will define current and future land use types and define other factors such as population density, design standards, and health and environmental needs and regulations among other factors. The Transport Master Plan will use this information as input to determine the transport needs and link them to the appropriate design of infrastructure, that is, public transport services, and multi-modal transfer points in order to provide adequate and sustainable traffic management. This information has been added to paragraph 122 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>   |
|                 |           | <p>7) Please clarify the actual length of the bike lane that is supported by GEF grant. Table B suggests 100 KM, while page 14 states 30 KM.</p>   | <p>The target of 100 km is the total length of bike lanes to be achieved through the investment of both GEF and cofinancing resources. The GEF grant will develop the design for 100 km of bike lanes around the AMA, but will support the actual construction of 30 km of that design. The other 70 km will be implemented by the municipal and central governments through cofinancing. Clarified in Table B of the CEO Endorsement and paragraph 40 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>  |
|                 |           | <p>8) Who will be the targeted audience of the web-based information platform? Is its life expectancy same with the project period? If not, where is the funding source?</p>   | <p>The target audience will be the general population of the AMA, but emphasizing on people looking for traffic and transport information. During project implementation GEF resources will be used to build the web-based platform, publicize it, and train the government personnel for maintaining the website. Once the project is over the actual maintenance and coordination of information will be undertaken by the municipal and central governments, as follows: The Asuncion Municipality will provide information on traffic regulations, street construction and</p>  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | GEFSEC comments  | Responses  |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           |  | <p>detours, and bike routes; the Vice-Ministry of Transport will provide bus route information regarding how to get from point A to Z, as well fare prices and time tables. The web-based platform will have to be flexible enough that either the central government or the municipal governments will be able to upload and update information. It will also have a forum/web-space for citizens to alert on traffic or transport problems occurring in real time, either for the government to take action or to help other citizens. The Technical Planning Secretariat (STP) will serve as the natural nexus between the Municipal and the Central governments and will provide cofinancing through the project life to maintain and work with the developers of the website. The STP will receive training to build its capacities to understand the necessities of maintaining and updating the infrastructure needed for the web-based platform and will by the end of the project assume the responsibility. This information has been added to paragraph 124 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>   |
|                 |           | <p>9) In terms of “developing vehicle emissions and maintenance standards,” please explain which government agency is authorized to issue and/or enforce standards. Is the agency part of the Project Board?</p> | <p>As of today there is no central government regulation that sets vehicle emissions and maintenance standards. At the municipal level each municipality is able to dictate their own standards and maintenance, above those set by the central government. Since there are no central government standards the municipality sets standards based on their own experience. In the AMA, only the Municipality of Asuncion has air quality standards, which then again, are loosely applied due to lack of institutional capacity. The Air Quality Law (N°5211) was issued in 2014 and falls under the jurisdiction of the Environment Secretariat (SEAM). The law mandates the SEAM with elaboration and enforcement of such standards. Through the GEF grant the SEAM will receive technical assistance to monitor the current air quality parameters in the AMA and set standards based on the current base line. The AMA municipalities will have to adapt their regulations based on the new law and the standards developed. The SEAM and the Municipality of Asuncion are members of the Project Board. This information has been included in paragraph 42 of the GEF-UNDP Project document.</p>  |
|                 |           | <p>10) Please briefly list the criteria used to identify “the best routes.”</p>  | <p>In Paraguay bus routes are public but the buses themselves are privately owned creating an intense competition between companies. Currently there is an over crowding of buses in certain city streets while others streets do not receive enough buses at certain times. For instance, in Asunción’s main artery there are more than 50 different private bus companies that have their own schedule and at certain times they all travel the same route without any demand to cover or in worst cases they compete for the demand there is, creating a chaotic traffic system. This is due to the lack of any public transport route planning. In order to determine the “best routes”, the project will support an optimization model considering the constraints and a set of objectives to maximize or minimize. The constraints could be limiting the number of buses in certain city streets to rationalize the existing demand during certain periods of the day, another would be to supply more low-emission buses to serve the entire city, and another could be reducing the amount of kilometers traveled and emissions. The initial traffic and transport survey, as well as the pilot with 30 routes will serve to gather new data on real conditions to optimize the bus routing and bus stop shelters model. These will be defined as part of the development of the optimization model. The initial traffic and transport</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | GEFSEC comments  | Responses  |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           |  | survey to be undertaken under Output 1.4, as well as the pilot with 30 routes (Output 2.3) will serve to gather new data on real conditions to optimize the bus routing and bus stop shelters model. This information has been included in paragraph 128 of the GEF-UNDP Project document.   |
|                 |           | Outcome 3:<br>11) Please articulate how integrated solid waste management strategy – reduce, reuse and recycle – will be applied to outcome 3.   | An integrated MSW 3Rs strategy as such will not be applied. However, reduction and recycling will be addressed in the Component through 2 of the pilot projects. The Asuncion MSW Master Plan determined in their baseline study that “...the city does not implement waste reduction and/or separation programs” and also the Master Plan envisages “an increase from 1.5% to 18% of recycling rate”. In Component 3, the second pilot project will include campaigns for reduction at source (see paragraph 141) and separation; the third pilot project is specific on recycling and will also include campaigns to recycle (paragraph 148). Therefore, the project will help develop a 3Rs strategy through demonstrating the results of the two pilot projects and the Asuncion MSW management Plan will be strengthened (This has been included in paragraph 50).  |
|                 |           | 12) Please clarify if the outputs 3.1-3.3 will contribute to preventing and reducing emissions of UPOPs and other toxic chemicals.   | Yes. By introducing better MSW management practices that will reduce two known sources of UPOPs: dump sites burning (containing plastics such as PVC and e-waste, as known sources of UPOPs) and the release from obsolete (POPs and non-POPs) pesticides and their containers (see paragraph 46) into the dumpsites. Output 1.4 will also support the national government to develop an integrated inventory of hazardous wastes (see Paragraph 92), a municipal ordinance for management of hazardous substances, based on the above inventory; and technical guidelines for management and inspection of hazardous wastes (see Paragraph 93).   |
|                 |           | Outcome 4:<br>13) Please articulate how the proposed “Land Use Plans” will guide the establishment of “Asuncion Green Corridor.”   | The land use plan will define current and future land use key parameters such as population density, urban and mobility design standards, health indexes, green infrastructure and environmental regulations, among other factors. The Green Corridor Action Plan will use this information as input to determine the future management and development of green infrastructure within the corridor and to expand the corridor to include other green areas within the AMA, in order to convey an optimum and sustainable network of green areas to preserve and enhance urban biodiversity. This information has been added to paragraph 165 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document   |
|                 |           | 14) Please clarify how the integration of “urban biodiversity conservation” in the city, will lead to reduction of air pollution, increased resilience, and maintenance of carbon stocks | Ecosystem services provided by urban nature include air pollution regulation, micro-climate regulation, protection against hazards, noise reduction, rainwater drainage, sewage treatment and recreational/cultural services, food (through urban agriculture) and other ecosystem services. Cities and urbanizing areas experience problems such as fragmentation of natural habitats, simplification and homogenization of species composition, disruption of hydrological systems, and alteration of energy flow and nutrient cycling. It is accepted that greater biological diversity leads to greater productivity in plant communities, greater nutrient retention in ecosystems and greater ecosystem stability. Ecosystem processes are less stable at lower diversity, reducing resilience. This leaves systems vulnerable to shifts and can affect the capacity of the urban area to absorb changing conditions, including due to climate change. |



| Review Criteria  | Questions | GEFSEC comments  | Responses  |
|--|-----------|--|--|
|  |           |  | <p>Maintaining healthy biodiversity contributes significantly to the resilience of a city as intact ecosystems can both reduce the impacts of extreme weather events and improve food and water security. Urban biodiversity can also play a role in sequestering carbon. Urban green areas, such as parks, lawns and urban forests, are the major sources of biodiversity in and around cities, therefore a network of green areas is among the most effective instruments by which to preserve and enhance urban biodiversity<sup>9 10</sup>.</p> <p>As described in the project document, Asuncion has a rich endowment of natural resources in part because of its location on the shores of the Paraguay river and its position at the confluence of four distinct ecoregions, along with its unusually high number of green areas for a city of this size and stage in growth, which in turn host a unique biodiversity of global significance. The proposed green corridor will provide this network of green areas to preserve this biological richness thus ensuring the stability of ecosystem processes in the city. It will improve the conservation and management of the existing green public and private areas. Within the framework of the green corridor, a number of activities are foreseen to enhance biodiversity conservation e.g. improving management effectiveness of urban protected areas, restoration of habitats, and reforestation/enrichment with native species (linear parks, plazas and patios and lawns. Conservation of forests and grasslands will maintain carbon stocks.</p> |
|  |           | 15) Overall GEBs include a) 1,227,442 tCO <sub>2</sub> e emissions mitigated and sequestered; b) 13.2 gTEQ UPOP emissions reduced; and c) increase in 1% of global populations (number of individuals) of 5 species found seasonally at site How will these benefits be quantified as tangible GEBs from the city? | Most of the interventions of the Project that generate GEB will be carried out in Asunción, so they can be considered as tangible GEB from the city. Calculation on GEB will be made based on common practices and methodologies, such as the recommended on the Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of Global Environment Facility Transportation Projects, or the Toolkit for Identification and Quantification of Releases of Dioxins, Furans and Other Unintentional POPs.  |
|  |           | 16) How will this approach to multiple GEBs position the AMA as a model for the country and beyond?  | Asuncion is the main city in Paraguay which places it in the example setter and leading force on the implementation of new policies and approaches of local government and civil society participation, such as the initiatives proposed in the child project. The implementation of the project will identify the best alternatives to foster a sustainable approach on city planning and government which can be replicated to the rest of Paraguay and the región.  |
| 4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of |           | Please add a risk – implemented pilot investment project will not continue operation after the project completion – and provide mitigation strategies.   | The risk has been added to Table 5 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document (page 58)  |

<sup>9</sup> Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2012) *Cities and Biodiversity Outlook*. Montreal, 64 pages.

<sup>10</sup> “Puppim de Oliveira, J. A. ; Shih,Wan-yu; Moreno-Peñaranda, R.; Phillips, A. (2014). Integrating Biodiversity with Local and City Planning: The Experience of the Studies in the Development of Local Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans – LBSAPs. Tokyo: United Nations University-Institute for Advance Study of Sustainability.”

| Review Criteria | Questions   | GEFSEC comments   | Responses  |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
|                 | climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)           |   |  |
|                 | 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?   | Yes.<br>please clarify where the project ID (6946) came from. According to GEF PMIS, the GEF ID should be 9127. | B<br>Corrected accordingly.  |
|                 | 8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | Please describe the project's synergies with related initiatives by bi-lateral and multi-lateral donors.        | <p>The project will coordinate with the following IDB initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDB Loan PR-L1044 “Downtown Redevelopment, Modernization Metropolitan Public Transport, Government Offices” has the overall objective of increasing the quality of life of the population through rehabilitating and improving the urban and transport infrastructure. The key components of this program are the downtown redevelopment and government offices, which primarily addresses the construction of new government offices as well as several public spaces in Asuncion’s historical center; and the transport component, which finances the implementation of the Metrobus. The historical center is part of the proposed Asuncion Green Corridor; therefore the proposed improvements in public spaces to be undertaken by this program will be framed within the corridor proposal, and will be incorporated in the corridor’s action plan. The proposed GEF interventions under Outcome 2 build upon the transport component of this program, which also constitutes the cofinancing for this Outcome.</li> <li>• IDB Loan PR-L1029 “Integrated Sanitation Program of Asuncion”, which seeks to improve sanitation infrastructure for rehabilitation and expansion of sewerage of basins that drain to the Asuncion Bay; construct a wastewater treatment plant and indoor plumbing for the low-income population of the area; and develop a comprehensive management plan for the basin of the Asuncion Bay. This program will help reduce the flow of contaminants from the wider urban area around the Asuncion Bay, where the <i>Banco San Miguel</i> and <i>Bahia de Asuncion</i> Ecological Reserve (RBSMBA) is located. This will strengthen the efforts and impact of the GEF intervention in the RBSMBA (e.g. cleanup of the RBSMBA, restoration of habitats for migratory species, development of infrastructure for visitors and tourism) in the medium and long term. The RBSMBA management plan to be finalized through the GEF project will be linked to the wider management plan of the Asuncion Bay basin to be developed by this program. Additionally, the program will provide cofinancing for implementation of the RBSMBA management plan.</li> </ul> <p>This information has been added to Section A.6 paragraph 33 of the CEO Endorsement</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | GEFSEC comments | Responses |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                 |           |                 | Request.  |

**GEF Council Comments on “Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC) and Knowledge Management and Coordination for Participating Cities (P156504; GEF ID 9077)”  
Matrix of Team’s Responses to GEF Council Comments (June 2015)**

**Comments were received from:**

- Canada
- France
- Germany
- USA

| Comments   | Team responses   |
|--|--|
| <b>1. GPSC v. Existing Initiatives</b>   |  |
| <p>The proposal has parallels to the very successful Cities Development Initiative Asia (CDIA, with parallel funding from BMZ and ADB), which supports medium sized Asian municipalities in infrastructure projects development and access to finance (from development banks and private sector). It needs to be ensured that this project can learn from CDIA’s experiences and success factors. <b>[Germany]</b></p> <p>The PFD provides too few details of the activities the program will support and how they will differ from those of other organizations that are developing similar sustainable cities-focused programs. We expect that the PFD will be modified to respond to STAP comments, and look forward to reviewing the child projects for this program prior to GEF CEO Endorsement. <b>[USA]</b></p>   | <p>We acknowledge the importance of learning from existing initiatives and will work closely with Cities Development Initiative Asia as well as other entities working on the urban sustainability agenda to avoid duplication of efforts and to leverage their knowledge and expertise in certain fields. The GPSC is unique among existing initiatives in that it works to operationalize the knowledge shared and learned in the fully-funded projects of the 27 pilot cities. The immediacy in impact is a rare opportunity for urban practitioners to translate the learned knowledge into a better designed and implemented project. In addition, as a knowledge platform, the GPSC is able to help cities navigate the overwhelming amount of initiatives and knowledge on urban sustainability. The GPSC can also serve as a global network for collaborative engagement on the urban agenda. In addition, the GPSC can contribute to the implementation of the SGD goals. The GPSC concept note outlines the types of activities the program will support.</p>  |
| <b>2. Common Framework &amp; Scope</b>   |  |
| <p>The project will contribute to promote among participating cities an approach to urban sustainability that is guided by evidence-based, multi-dimensional, and broadly inclusive planning processes that balance economic, social, and environmental resource considerations.</p> <p>We globally support this proposal but we would like to underline the following points.</p> <p>Indeed, regarding the aim of the project and its thematic and geographical (11 countries) scope, it seems that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the common methodological framework could be strengthened by systematically conducting vulnerability studies on hydrological, environmental and socio-economic aspects. These studies will notably allow to take into account resilience and adaptation to climate change;</li> <li>- the common framework of knowledge capitalization must be more precise ;</li> <li>- the issues of urban mobility, in particular in Abidjan, might benefit from the application of innovative planning tools based on analysis of</li> </ul> | <p>We agree that a common framework is key, given the wide range of thematic and geographic scope of the program. As such, the GPSC proposes an integrated approach based on 4 components: (i) indicators for urban sustainability and geospatial data/tools, (ii) urban planning, (iii) urban finance, (iv) partnerships and engagement. Within this framework, each interested city will develop a roadmap to sustainability.</p> <p>We agree that a systematic assessment of the cities will help given the vast thematic and geographical scope of the program—the GPSC will develop a common assessment framework that may include vulnerability studies. Through these assessments, a more tailored, city-specific action plan will be developed as one of the possible Joint Deliverables. The GPSC will serve as a knowledge repository as well as a collaborative forum where knowledge can be accessed and shared. Case studies of the participating cities will also be developed at the end of the program.</p> <p>We agree with the suggestion of using Big Data in understanding urban mobility issues and look forward to investigating that modality with the Abidjan child project as</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Big Data that have already been tested in these contexts.<br/> <b>Opinion:</b> Favorable provided the above comments are taken into account in the design phase.<br/> <b>[France]</b></p> <p>While we recognize that multidimensionality is an aspect of the program, it may be useful to limit the variables for each city. This would make the information more comparable, make it easier to assess overall objectives of the program, and facilitate the exchange and dissemination of knowledge. <b>[Canada]</b></p>   | <p>part of the Joint Deliverables.</p> <p>We agree to limiting the variables for each city for ease of implementation and evaluation and will endeavor to keep this in mind.</p>   |
| <p><b>3. Risks</b></p>   |  |
| <p>The scope of this IAP will make it difficult to sufficiently finance and manage, and it is uncertain that funding and resources spread across 23 cities will result in the desired beneficial outcome for improving local sustainability planning efforts. Please strengthen the proposal to show how these risks will be mitigated. <b>[Canada]</b></p>  | <p>We agree that the funding is not enough to achieve the desired change and scope of the program. Taking a more realistic approach given the limited budget can help direct the limited budget to key priorities instead of trying to overcommit. The Joint Deliverables approach attempts to address this by dedicating resources to jointly-agreed upon actions at the city-level: the GPSC, the implementing agencies, and the participating cities will deliver a set of joint activities at the city-level, focusing on geospatial data/tools, indicators, urban planning, and urban finance. More details on this approach can be found in our Concept Note.</p> <p>The GPSC will also rely upon existing initiatives to leverage the knowledge and resources of entities currently working on the urban sustainability agenda. We acknowledge that the SC IAP program poses many challenges and have tried to address the details of planning and timelines in our Concept Note. The GPSC will also focus on shared themes and common challenges of the participating cities in GPSC learning activities and products.</p> |
| <p><b>4. Miscellaneous</b></p>   |  |
| <p>Please clearly outline the methodology for this IAP, including: the criteria used to choose cities; and, the criteria that will be used to measure the effectiveness, efficiency, budgetary cost, and level of stakeholder engagement involved within each child project. <b>[Canada]</b></p> <p>We note that sound management of harmful chemicals and wastes in urban environment is an expected outcome of the IAP. This link should be strengthened in the project proposal, as only two cities identified chemicals and wastes management as a dimension of their project. We propose that more emphasis be placed on the objective of developing “the enabling conditions, tools and environment for the sound management of harmful chemicals and wastes” within all pilot cities proposals, and more detail be included as to how</p> | <p>The Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (SC IAP) is an integrated program consisting of two tracks: (a) City-level projects in 27 cities across 11 countries, with around US\$140 million in GEF grant funding. Each country is supported by one or several implementing agencies to manage the various projects in the participating cities. (b) The Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC), led by the World Bank with US\$10 million in GEF grant funding. The GPSC is a knowledge platform that ties all participating cities together and creates a collaborative space for cities aspiring towards sustainability to engage with entities already working in the urban realm.</p> <p>Within this framework, it is important to clarify that the World Bank is the lead organization for the GPSC track. However, the World Bank did not play a major role in defining the “methodology for this IAP” (i.e. the criteria used to choose the cities,</p>  |

this objective would be met. [**Canada**]

etc.) nor in defining the scope of each project in all pilot cities.

**STAP Scientific and Technical Screening of the Project Identification Form (P156504)**

**Matrix of Team's Responses to STAP Comments (Date of STAP Screening: April 14, 2015)**

**Screener:** Christine Wellington-Moore of GEF STAP prepared the comments

| Comments  | Team responses   |
|---|--|
| <b>5. Collective Impact and Stakeholder Engagement</b>  |  |
| <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 <a href="http://www.fsg.org/OurApproach/WhatIsCollectiveImpact.aspx">http://www.fsg.org/OurApproach/WhatIsCollectiveImpact.aspx</a>)</p> <p>Isolated Impacts:- Funders select individual grantees that offer the most promising solutions</p> <p>Collective Impacts:- Funders and implementers understand that social problems, and their solutions, arise from the interaction of many organizations within a larger system</p> | <p>The GPSC acknowledges the important role that stakeholder engagement plays in urban change and has been designed in such a way to ensure that all relevant stakeholders will be involved in the GPSC's design and implementation process. The Program-Level Results Framework measures stakeholder engagement in the design and implementation of IAP child projects (Indicator 3: Number of cities with meaningful engagement of multiple stakeholders in planning and implementation of the projects supported by the IAP).</p> <p>To ensure that the GPSC achieves a lasting, collective impact, the GPSC will coordinate and collaborate with the relevant entities working in the larger web of urban sustainability. Working within this larger web, the GPSC will actively coordinate its actions to complement and build off of current work, actively seeking to communicate and align initiatives—as demonstrated by the Joint Deliverables section of the PCN. The GPSC, the implementing agencies, and the participating cities will deliver a set of joint activities at the city-level, focusing on geospatial data/tools, indicators, urban planning, and urban finance. To achieve this, the GPSC will have to actively partner with the implementing agencies, international organizations and networks, local</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Isolated Impacts:- Non-profits work separately and compete to produce the greatest independent impact</p> <p>Collective Impact:- Progress depends on working toward the same goal and measuring the same things</p> <p>Isolated Impacts:- Evaluation attempts to isolate a particular organization's impact</p> <p>Collective Impacts:- Large scale impact depends on increasing cross-sector alignment and learning among many organizations</p> <p>Isolated Impacts:- Large scale change is assumed to depend on scaling a single organization</p> <p>Collective Impacts:- Corporate and government sectors are essential partners</p> <p>Isolated Impacts:- Corporate and government sectors are often disconnected from the efforts of foundations and nonprofits</p> <p>Collective Impacts:- Organizations actively coordinate their action and shared lessons learned.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>governments, civil societies, and the private sector.</p> <p>The design of the GPSC endeavors to encompass the right conditions for a successful collective impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Common Agenda/Framework: The objectives of the GPSC are to (i) provide a platform for knowledge sharing and learning on an integrated approach to urban planning and management, (ii) create a space for networking and learning among cities and relevant organizations on issues related to urban sustainable development, and (iii) support the participating cities' work on evidence-based urban planning with the aim of forging an agreed-upon common vision and approach to urban sustainability. The Joint Deliverables at the city-level attempt to co-align actions and approaches. The Joint Deliverables framework will focus on urban indicators and geospatial data/tools, urban planning, and urban finance at the city-level.</li> <li>2. Shared Measurement: All participating cities will share a common urban sustainability framework for selecting indicators and geospatial datasets that are relevant to the city's contexts. In addition to this shared framework, participating cities will be encouraged to adopt core common indicators that reflects progress made towards UN SDG 11. The GEF Tracking Tool and Program-Level Results Framework will be tracked across all 11 child projects at the program-level to measure and report the progress of each child project.</li> <li>3. Mutually Reinforcing Activities: The PCN of the GPSC indicates the type of coordinated activities that will be offered through collaboration with urban think tanks, networks, and implementing agencies. Cities interested in participating in Joint Deliverables will develop a city-specific</li> </ol> |
|--|--|



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

work program outlining a set of differentiated activities around the GPSC framework.

4. **Continuous Communication:** The GPSC holds a monthly conference call with all implementing agencies to ensure frequent and structured open communication to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation. In addition, GPSC will conduct active and inclusive city-level consultations with the implementing agencies to define a relevant city-level work program.
5. **Backbone Support:** The GPSC will provide 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.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>the program 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 (<a href="http://www.collectiveimpactforum.org/">http://www.collectiveimpactforum.org/</a>). 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.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>6. Results Framework</b></p>   |  |
| <p>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&amp;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&amp;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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | <p>The GPSC aims to support cities in developing or adopting an evidence-based, integrated approach toward resilient and sustainable cities. As such, the GPSC will lead the development of a comprehensive framework that supports cities in choosing among a suite of locally-specific indicators based on common criteria. As part of the Joint Deliverables, cities wishing to enhance their capacity for measuring urban sustainability will receive guidance on selecting and implementing a set of locally relevant indicators. This work will be part of the GPSC's work towards enhancing a city's capacity for an evidence-based planning approach that is not tied to the duration of the program.</p> <p>Separate from the city-level work on indicators, the GPSC, as a child project of the SC IAP, has developed a results framework to evaluate its progress as a knowledge platform during the duration of the program.</p> <p>At the SC IAP program-level are two results frameworks that attempt to assess the results of all 11 child projects + GPSC: the GEF Tracking Tool and the Program-Level</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>alignment between child projects and overall program goals. <u>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.</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>   | <p>Results Framework.</p>   |
| <p><b>7. Knowledge Management</b></p>  |   |
| <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>The GPSC fully acknowledges the wide range of ongoing initiatives and currently existing knowledge on urban sustainability and does not attempt to duplicate them. In addition to serving as a platform for knowledge sharing, it endeavors to compile lessons learned from the child projects and promote innovation through collaboration and knowledge exchange. Case studies on each city will be created at the end of the program to evaluate whether the knowledge positively affected the urban processes and systems. Given the limited budget and timeline, it is unlikely that the GPSC will be heavily engaged in knowledge creation activities but rather it will prioritize knowledge curation and sharing through its platform.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>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.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>8. Program Structure</b></p>   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Pilot Cities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Link to other IAPs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A review of child projects indicates potential opportunities for linkages with other IAPs (e.g. 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p><u>Number of Pilot Cities:</u></p> <p>- We agree that the funding is not enough to achieve the desired change and suggest tempering expectations. The funding is simply insufficient to achieve the long-lasting, in-depth change to which the Pilot Program professes to aspire. Taking a more realistic approach given the limited budget can help direct the limited budget to key priorities instead of trying to overcommit. The Joint Deliverables approach attempts to address this by dedicating resources to jointly-agreed upon actions at the city-level. The GPSC will also rely upon existing initiatives to leverage the knowledge and resources of entities currently working on the urban sustainability agenda.</p> <p><u>Link to other IAPs:</u></p> <p>- We will recommend to the South Africa child project that synergies with the IAP on Food Security be sought.</p> |
| <p><b>9. Miscellaneous Comments</b></p>  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table C of PFD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <p><u>Table C of PFD:</u></p> <p>- We agree that there has been confusion about the precise</p>  |

report. There are also several instances of acronyms used without explanations.

- Section E of PFD: “Program’s target contributions to GEBs”

- The only relevant target shown is the mitigation of 106,669,069 metric tons 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 programs.

- Program Challenges

- 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 program, 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.

municipalities to be covered in each country. Currently, we have identified 27 participating cities: Xalapa, La Paz (Mexico), Campeche, Recife, Brasilia, Johannesburg, Abidjan, Vijayawada, Guntur, Bhopal, Jaipur, Mysore, Melaka, Saint-Louis (Senegal), Greater Dakar (Diamniadio Industrial Park), Guiyang, Shenzhen, Ningbo, Nanchang, Beijing, Tianjin, Shijiazhuang, Lima, Asuncion, Hue, Ha Giang, and Vinh Yen.

Section E of PFD:

- Given that many cities use various GHG emissions methodologies, it was agreed at the first GPSC meeting in March 2016 that though there will not be a standard methodology, participating cities will be required to report their target contributions to GHG emissions according to internationally accepted methods and to disclose their methodology.

Program Challenges:

- We acknowledge that the SC IAP program poses many challenges and have tried to address the details of planning and timelines in our PCN. We are sensitive to resource constraints of cities and are in continued conversation with the implementing agencies to ensure that enough resources are allocated to ensure the successful participation of cities in GPSC activities throughout the duration of the program. The GPSC will focus on shared themes and common challenges of the participating cities in GPSC learning activities and products.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

| <b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 100,000.00</b>  |   |                                    |                                |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>  | <b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i></b> |                                    |                                |
|   | <b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>           | <b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b> | <b><i>Amount Committed</i></b> |
| Project preparation grant to finalize the UNDP-GEF project document for project "Asuncion Green City of the Americas: Pathways to Sustainability" | 100,000.00                              | 73,056.26                          | 26,943.74                      |

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A