



1818 H Street, N.W.,
Washington D.C., 20433 USA
Tel: 202 473 3202; Fax: 202 522 1691/522 3240
E-mail: gefevaluation@thegef.org

Approach Paper

Formative Process Review of the
Sustainable Cities
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Program

22 February 2017

Contact:
Dennis Bours
Evaluation Officer
Dbours@theGEF.org

Table of Contents

Acronyms	2
Background	3
Cities IAP Program: Objectives and Implementation.....	4
Formative Process Review: Purpose and Objectives	6
Scope and Key Questions.....	6
Approach, Resources and Timeline.....	7
References	9
Annex 1: Cities IAP project overview	10
Annex 2: Global Environmental Benefit (GEB) targets	12
Annex 3: Evaluation Matrix.....	13

Acronyms

CEO	Chief Executive Officer
GEB	Global Environmental Benefit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPSC	Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
IAP	Integrated Approach Pilot
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
OPS-6	the sixth Overall Performance Study
PFD	Program Framework Document
PMIS	Project Management Information System
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
STAR	System for Transparent Allocation of Resources
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
WRI	World Resources Institute

Background

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is an international financial institution that provides grants to developing countries and countries with economies in transition for projects that address global environmental concerns related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals and waste. The governance structure of the GEF includes an Assembly, a Council, a Secretariat, a Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and an Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

2. As part of its work program for the sixth replenishment phase of the GEF (GEF-6), and feeding into the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6), the IEO has been tasked¹ to review the GEF Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Program being implemented in GEF-6, and developed building on the GEF past experience in designing and implementing programmatic approaches.² This program is composed of three pilots: (i) the **Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot Program** (in short, Cities IAP)³; (ii) the *Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa* Integrated Approach Pilot Program (in short, **Food Security IAP**)⁴; and (iii) the *Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains* Integrated Approach Pilot Program (in short, the **Commodities IAP**)⁵. These three pilots were built on existing linkages and connections across focal areas, and have in common that they are designed with the objective to address global environmental issues more holistically, within a much broader and more complex set of development challenges: *“This integrated approach would be crosscutting, synergistic, and cost-effective, and directed at some of the underlying drivers of environmental degradation globally and within priority regions. The integrated approach pilots would complement GEF focal areas strategies in the up-coming GEF-6 portfolio, and seek to further encourage early adoption and scaling up of projects and programs that overcome focal area silos and build on the necessary linkages that help achieve sustainable development goals. This systemic, sectoral and crosscutting framework will also include renewed emphasis on private sector, gender equality and women’s empowerment”*.⁶

3. This Approach Paper refers to the formative process review of the Cities IAP program. Given that many of the “child projects” under the Cities IAP program have yet to commence implementation by the GEF agencies at the time of writing (see annex 1 for project status), this review has adopted a formative approach and will focus on process and design aspects at the start-up of the pilot, its uptake by key stakeholders in the target countries and the process through which it is being launched.

4. IEO is also currently conducting the Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches in the GEF.⁷ The main purpose of this major thematic evaluation is to assess whether and how GEF support delivered under the programmatic approaches modality has delivered the expected results in terms of global environmental benefits while addressing the main drivers of global environmental change, and how their results compare to stand-alone projects. It also aims at providing evidence on the performance of GEF programs. Evidence and emerging findings from the programmatic approaches evaluation will contribute to the review of the Cities as well as the Food Security and the Commodities IAPs.

¹ IEO, [Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF \(OPS6\) - Approach Paper](#), May 2016.

² GEF, [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), May 2014.

³ GEF, [PFD document of Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9077, April 2015.

⁴ GEF, [PFD document of Food Security-IAP: Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9070, May 2015.

⁵ GEF, [PFD document of Commodities-IAP: Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9072, April 2015.

⁶ *GEF-6 Programming Directions, op. cit.*, 173.

⁷ IEO, [Evaluation of the Programmatic Approaches in the GEF](#), March 2016.

Cities IAP Program: Objectives and Implementation

5. The Cities IAP is well summarized in the related Program Framework Document (PFD, GEF ID 9077).⁸ Its overall objective is to *“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”*.⁹ The Cities IAP will initially engage 23 cities, and later 28 cities, in 11 countries with the aim to promote the integration of environmental sustainability in planning and management initiatives at the city level.¹⁰ The program will primarily do so by providing tools, knowledge resources, and services to support local strategic planning processes and implementation efforts in targeted cities.

6. The Cities IAP recognizes challenges to rapid urbanization in developing countries but also the opportunity this presents. Climate change adds to the urgency of sustainable urban planning and management, and to the already broad set of challenges for many city governments, revolving around providing jobs, services and housing to rapidly growing urban populations.¹¹ If managed well, compact, resilient, inclusive and resource-efficient cities could become drivers of sustainable development. If managed poorly, sprawling urban areas will result in land degradation, strain ecosystems and essential infrastructure services, and increase levels of air and water pollution. The Cities IAP will support local strategic planning processes and implementation efforts in selected cities. What sets the IAP apart from other urban sustainability initiatives, according to the documentation, is: an emphasis on comprehensive, evidence based planning in support and investments in institutional processes and capacity building; a comprehensive suite of support services; a network approach that recognizes the need to nurture relationships with a wide range of stakeholders; and its contribution to the discourse on sustainable cities through global knowledge coordination, programmatic support and experience-sharing.¹²

7. The Cities IAP consists of an allocation of approximately US\$ 138 million in GEF resources during the GEF-6 programming period. Of this sum, US\$ 54 million in IAP program funds are to be directed to a limited number of child projects applying through (and with the endorsement of) their GEF country focal point. Applicants were required to match the IAP allocation on a dollar-for-dollar basis out of their regular national STAR (System for Transparent Allocation of Resources) allocation¹³, although all applicants ultimately opted to match at a higher ratio. In addition, child projects are expected to use their joint IAP/STAR allocation to leverage other public or private funds for use on these projects.¹⁴ The program also includes a US\$ 10 million resource allocation to the World Bank for creation of a global coordination and knowledge sharing platform, named the Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC, GEF ID 9162). another US\$ 2 million is allocated to the World Bank to collaboratively work with WRI (World Resources Institute), C40 and ICLEI as resource team for city-to-city and network knowledge sharing services under the GPSC (called “Urban Networking to Complement and Extend the Reach of the Sustainable Cities IAP”, GEF ID 9666). See Annex 1 for a project overview.

⁸ GEF, [PFD document of Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9077, April 2015.

⁹ Ibid., 2.

¹⁰ Brazil (Brasilia and Recife), China (Guiyang, Shenzhen, Ningbo, Nanchang, Beijing, Tianjin and Shijiazhuang), Cote d'Ivoire (Abidjan), India (Vijayawada, Guntur, Mysore, Jaipur and Bhopal), Malaysia (Melaka), Mexico (La Paz, Campeche and Xalapa), Paraguay (Gran Asuncion), Peru (Lima), Senegal (Dakar, Saint Louis and Diamniadio), South Africa (Johannesburg), Vietnam (Hue, Vinh Yen and Ha Giang).

¹¹ GEF, [Sustainable Cities GEF Integrated Approach Pilot](#), 4-page Glossy, November 2015.

¹² *Cities IAP PFD, op. cit.*, 7-10.

¹³ GEF, [System for Transparent Allocation of Resources \(STAR\)](#), Policy Document PL/RA/01, March 2013.

¹⁴ *Cities IAP PFD, op. cit.*, 9.

8. The Cities IAP is geared to contribute to Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) in the respective focal areas (see annex 2 for GEB targets), as well as implicitly contributing to country capacity to implement Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The program involves eight GEF Agencies, namely the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP); the United Nations Development Program (UNDP); the International Development Bank (IDB); the African Development Bank (AfDB); the Asian Development Bank (ADB); the Development Bank of South America (DBSA); the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank. Detailed program structure and planned regional capacity building and knowledge exchange platforms are shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Cities IAP Program Structure

9. The Cities IAP is designed to be implemented over five years in Brazil, China, Cote d'Ivoire, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, and Vietnam. The GPSC is aimed to tie the program together and is composed of 6 elements: sustainability planning support; tools and metrics; knowledge management; capacity building, financing sustainability and the global engagement facility.

10. The yearly progress of the Cities IAP program's development to date looks as follows:
- 2014: formal inclusion of the Cities IAP program in GEF-6 programming directions at General Assembly; development of sustainable urbanization policy brief by STAP; development of concept paper and consultative meeting; initial consultations with GEF agencies and potential country partners;
- 2015: overarching program design by the World Bank in collaboration with GEF agencies involved in the child projects and GEF Secretariat; presentation and approval at the June Council of Program Framework Document; requests for and allocations of Project Preparation Grants for multiple GEF agencies and country partners;
- 2016: on-going design of child projects by GEF agencies; submission of Requests for Project Endorsement; issuance of endorsement letters for the global child project "Global Platform for Sustainable Cities (GPSC, GEF ID 9162)", the global stand-alone project "Urban Networking to Complement and Extend the Reach of the Sustainable Cities IAP" (GEF ID 9666), and 4 country-level child projects out of 11 planned,
- 2017: Two more country-level child projects received endorsement letters; By January 2017, seven child projects and 1 stand-alone project have received endorsement letters, 3 are PM recommended and 2 are pending endorsement.

Formative Process Review: Purpose and Objectives

11. The purpose of the Cities IAP formative process review is to critically assess the potential of the Cities IAP to generate multiple GEBs by tackling one of the main drivers of environmental degradation – processes of unsustainable urbanization in rapidly growing cities of Asia, Africa and Latin America.
12. The objectives are to evaluate the coherence of the Cities IAP design with GEF-6 focal area strategies, its alignment with convention guidance and its capacity to reflect synergies in delivering focal area strategies while accounting for country needs and ownership. The review will also look at the Cities IAP initial uptake in participating countries and the efficiency of its launching process. This review is being undertaken as an input to the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (Overall Performance Study – OPS-6).

Scope and Key Questions

13. The review will look at the Cities IAP and related child projects, since the first development of the program concept at the beginning of GEF-6. The 7 main evaluation questions the review will aim to answer are as follows:
- i. To what extent is the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - truly integrated and does it differ from existing (non-)programmatically approaches?
 - ii. To what extent does IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - enable the GEF to fulfil its mandate vis-à-vis the Conventions?
 - iii. To what extent has the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - harnessed the comparative strengths, advantages and unique selling points of the GEF Agencies, STAP, the GEF Secretariat and broader constituencies and partnerships?

- iv. To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into account in the Cities IAP design?
 - v. How efficiently has the launch and design process of the Cities IAP program been, and what has been the buy-in by the target groups thus far?
 - vi. Have funding sources been strategically allocated for integrated programming (i.e. GEF set-aside funding, co-financing leverage)?
 - vii. To what extent are there mechanisms for broader adoption (mainstreaming, scale-up, replication, market transformation), features that enable knowledge capture and mechanisms for learning from previous projects?
14. An evaluation matrix composed of key questions, relevant indicators, sources of information and methods has been developed as result of a detailed evaluability assessment (see annex 3). The matrix is structured around the 7 key evaluation questions and includes specific quantitative and qualitative indicators as well as methods and sources of data collection.

Approach, Resources and Timeline

15. The Cities IAP review will apply a mixed methods approach, encompassing desk and literature review, quality at entry analysis through a portfolio review protocol developed jointly for the three parallel IAP reviews, portfolio and project cycle analysis, and perceptions gathering through interviews, and an online survey specifically designed to gather country stakeholder perceptions. Gender and resilience will be given special attention as cross-cutting topics.
16. Two in-depth literature/document reviews will take place with each their specific focus:
- i. The evolution of the Cities IAP and child projects' design and the interplay between GEF Secretariat, STAP, GEF Council, GEF Agencies, and country counterparts and stakeholders, with a focus on (1) the coherence between Cities IAP design, the Conventions, focal areas and GEF-6 programming directions, (2) whether the IAP concept provides additionality, compared to standard project approaches and previous programmatic approaches, (3) the efficiency of the Cities IAP launch and design process, and (4) the mechanisms for broader adoption, and features that enable knowledge capture and mechanisms for learning from previous projects.
 - ii. The Cities IAP's appropriateness and relevance of country and city selection, focusing on (1) specific needs for sustainable urban development, existing governance structures, and existing power and decision-making structures in the countries and cities selected, (2) alignment of priorities across scales (cityscape, sub-national, national, global) and buy-in by target groups at these levels, (3) whether and how this has translated into a selection of priorities across and within sectors, selected programming directions, and (4) whether these choices are reflected in the comparative strengths, advantages and unique selling points of the GEF Agencies leading the various projects and project components.
17. At least 15 structured interviews are planned with key stakeholders in the formulation and design of the Cities IAP. The aim of the interviews is to (a) fill-in factual gaps or add factual details to the evidence resulting from the in-depth literature/document review and portfolio review, and (b) to garner responses of different stakeholders to the main evaluation questions and sub-questions (see annex 3).
18. Triangulation of the information and qualitative as well as quantitative data collected will be conducted at completion of the data gathering and analysis phases, to determine trends and identify the

main findings, lessons and conclusions. Different stakeholders will be consulted during the process to test preliminary findings.

19. The evaluation will be conducted by a team led by an IEO Evaluation Officer – the Task Manager. The team includes two externally recruited senior evaluators and a research assistant who supports the portfolio review for the three parallel IAP reviews. The skills mix required to complete this review includes evaluation experience and knowledge of IEO’s methods and practices; familiarity with the policies, procedures and operations of GEF and its Agencies; knowledge of the GEF and external information sources; demonstrated skills and long term experience in urban sustainability, including its most recent developments and the urban planning-environment nexus, as well as practical, policy, and/or academic expertise in key GEF focal areas of the programs under analysis (i.e. climate change, biodiversity and chemicals and waste).

20. The IEO Task Manager will participate in the GPSC second global meeting, 15-19 May 2017, in Suzhou City – China, to reflect with key stakeholders on the early findings of the Cities IAP review.

21. The Cities IAP formative process review will be conducted between January and September 2017. The initial work plan, presented below, will be adapted as the review evolves and matures.

Task	Year Month	2017								
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Approach Paper			X							
Background information and scoping (issues/questions, time/scale, portfolio)		X	X							
Approach Paper uploaded on the IEO website			X							
In-depth literature/document reviews				X						
Portfolio review				X	X					
Interviews			X	X	X					
Online survey				X	X					
Consolidation of data and preliminary findings					X	X				
Gap filling/additional analyses/consolidation with the other two IAP reviews						X				
Draft Report					X	X	X			
Due diligence (gathering feedback and comments)						X	X	X		
Final Report								X	X	
Presentation to Council in the SAER										->
Edited report										->
Dissemination and outreach										->

Figure 2: Initial work plan

References

- GEF 2013. [System for Transparent Allocation of Resources \(STAR\)](#), Policy Document PL/RA/01, March 2013.
- GEF 2014. [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), May 2014.
- GEF 2015. [PFD document of Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9077, April 2015.
- GEF 2015. [PFD document of Commodities-IAP: Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9072, April 2015.
- GEF 2015. [PFD document of Food Security-IAP: Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa Integrated Approach Pilot \(IAP-PROGRAM\)](#), GEF ID 9070, May 2015.
- GEF 2015. [Sustainable Cities GEF Integrated Approach Pilot](#), 4-page Glossy, November 2015.
- IEO 2016. [Evaluation of the Programmatic Approaches in the GEF](#), March 2016.
- IEO 2016. [Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF \(OPS6\) - Approach Paper](#), May 2016.

Annex 1: Cities IAP project overview

Part 1: Project specifics

GEF ID	GEF Agency(ies)	Country	Focal Area	Focal Area Objectives / Programs	Project Title	Status	PA Level	Project Type
9077	World Bank	Global	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 3; BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9; CW-1 Program 2;	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)	Council Approved	Parent	FSP
9162	World Bank	Global	MFA	Cities IAP;	Sustainable Cities IAP - Global Platform for Sustainable Cities	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP
9666	World Bank	Global	CC	CCM-2 Program 3	Urban Networking to Complement and Extend the Reach of the Sustainable Cities IAP	CEO Approved	Stand-alone	MSP
9142	UNEP	Brazil	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3; BD-4 Program 9;	Cities-IAP: Promoting Sustainable Cities in Brazil through Integrated Urban Planning and Innovative Technologies Investment	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP
9223	World Bank	China	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3;	Sustainable Cities IAP – China Child Project	PM Recommended	Child	FSP
9130	AfDB / UNIDO	Cote d'Ivoire	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 3;	Cities-IAP: Abidjan Integrated Sustainable Urban Development	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP
9323	UNIDO	India	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3;	Sustainable cities, integrated approach pilot in India	PM Recommended	Child	FSP
9147	UNIDO	Malaysia	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-1 Program 1;	Sustainable-city development in Malaysia	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP
9649	IADB	Mexico	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-1 Program 1;	Enhancing Mexico's Environmental Sustainability in Regional Hubs	Pending	Child	FSP
9127	UNDP	Paraguay	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 3; BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9; CW-1 Program 2;	Asunción Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP
9698	IADB	Peru	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3; BD-4 Program 9;	National Platform for Sustainable Cities and Climate Change	Pending	Child	FSP
9123	World Bank / UNIDO	Senegal	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3; CW-1 Program 3;	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Management Initiative	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP
9145	UNEP / DBSA	South Africa	CC	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3;	Cities-IAP: Building a Resilient and Resource Efficient Johannesburg: Increased Access to Urban Services and Improved Quality of Life	PM Recommended	Child	FSP
9484	ADB	Vietnam	MFA	Cities IAP; CCM-2 Program 3; BD-4 Program 9;	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)	CEO Endorsed	Child	FSP

Part 2: Project financials

GEF ID	GEF Agency(ies)	Country	Project Title	Status	GEF Amount (US\$)	IAP Component (US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total project cost (US\$)	Agency fees (US\$)
9077	World Bank	Global	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)	Council Approved	137,522,072	53,880,680	1,478,647,433	1,616,169,505	12,403,984
9162	World Bank	Global	Sustainable Cities IAP - Global Platform for Sustainable Cities	CEO Endorsed	9,024,312	9,024,312	5,400,000	14,424,312	812,188
9666	World Bank	Global	Urban Networking to Complement and Extend the Reach of the Sustainable Cities IAP	CEO Approved	2,000,000	0	2,000,000	4,000,000	190,000
9142	UNEP	Brazil	Cities-IAP: Promoting Sustainable Cities in Brazil through Integrated Urban Planning and Innovative Technologies Investment	CEO Endorsed	22,635,780	4,587,156	195,650,658	218,286,438	2,037,220
9223	World Bank	China	Sustainable Cities IAP – China Child Project	PM Recommended	32,727,523	9,174,312	1,084,000,000	1,116,727,523	2,945,477
9130	AfDB / UNIDO	Cote d'Ivoire	Cities-IAP: Abidjan Integrated Sustainable Urban Development	CEO Endorsed	5,254,587	2,752,293	33,101,367	38,355,954	472,913
9323	UNIDO	India	Sustainable cities, integrated approach pilot in India	PM Recommended	12,110,092	3,139,653	113,953,705	126,063,797	1,089,908
9147	UNIDO	Malaysia	Sustainable-city development in Malaysia	CEO Endorsed	2,752,293	917,431	20,230,000	22,982,293	247,707
9649	IADB	Mexico	Enhancing Mexico's Environmental Sustainability in Regional Hubs	Pending	13,761,468	4,587,156	98,300,000	112,061,468	1,238,532
9127	UNDP	Paraguay	Asunción Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability	CEO Endorsed	7,493,120	1,809,862	240,340,000	247,833,120	674,381
9698	IADB	Peru	National Platform for Sustainable Cities and Climate Change	Pending	6,422,019	3,211,009	300,979,496	307,401,515	577,981
9123	World Bank / UNIDO	Senegal	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Management Initiative	CEO Endorsed	8,715,597	6,880,734	51,780,000	60,495,597	784,403
9145	UNEP / DBSA	South Africa	Cities-IAP: Building a Resilient and Resource Efficient Johannesburg: Increased Access to Urban Services and Improved Quality of Life	PM Recommended	8,093,171	3,596,965	124,439,330	132,532,501	728,385
9484	ADB	Vietnam	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)	CEO Endorsed	8,256,881	3,669,725	148,472,900	156,729,781	743,119

Annex 2: Global Environmental Benefit (GEB) targets

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Cities IAP program targets according to PFD	Sum of child projects' targets according to project endorsement requests
GEB 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.	0 hectares	128,695 hectares
GEB 2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management.	0 hectares	80 hectares
GEB 3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services.	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins.	0 number of freshwater basins	0 number of freshwater basins
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels.	0 percent of fisheries, by volume	0 percent of fisheries, by volume
GEB 4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path.	750 million tons of CO ₂ e mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	100,118,756 tCO ₂ e	Min. 649,790,242 tCO ₂ e Max. 660,069,242 tCO ₂ e
GEB 5. 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).	0 metric tons	13.7 gTeq
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury.	0 metric tons	
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC).	0 metric tons	
GEB 6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks.	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries.	0 countries	0 countries
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries.	0 countries	0 countries

Annex 3: Evaluation Matrix

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
1. To what extent is the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - truly integrated and does it differ from existing (non-)programmatic approaches?					
1. a. To what extent is the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - aligned with GEF-6 programming directions and the STAR resource allocation framework?			Program and Project Documents World Bank, Habitat and ADB documents	Desk analysis Project review protocol	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Objectives and priorities of Parent and CPs are aligned with one another	Relevance	Strategic			
Objectives and priorities of Parent and CPs are aligned with GEF-6 programming directions					
Origins and rationale of GEF-6 programming directions alignment with regard to urban sustainability					
Objectives and priorities of Parent and CPs are aligned with STAR resource allocation framework					
Evidence of alignment of Cities IAP with the STAR resource allocation framework					
Evidence as to whether STAR allocation affected countries' willingness to participate in Cities IAP					
Evidence of coherence and integration in program design					
Profile of standard GEF project approaches in urban interventions					
Approaches of other key international programs fostering urban sustainability					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
1.b To what extent does the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - promote synergies between GEF focal areas?					
PFD and CP results frameworks contain outcome and impact indicators that contribute to results across GEF focal areas	Relevance	Strategic	Program and Project Documents	Desk analysis Project review protocol	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Focus on major drivers, in the PFD and CP documents, that promote synergies in delivering focal area strategies					
Alignment between focal areas in the PFD and CP documents					
Rationale for the selection of some GEF focal areas aligned with Cities IAP					
Rationale for non-inclusion of LCDF/SCCF (an adaptation component) as focal area in Cities IAP					
1.c To what extent does the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - demonstrate alignment of priorities across scales (cityscale, national and global)?					
Specific measures planned at country level to enhance cooperation across ministries, agencies and other stakeholders; strategies; and at multiple levels	Relevance	Strategic	Program and Project Documents Key stakeholders of GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Stakeholder group includes agencies at city, national and global scales					
Common priorities found in strategies and programs of stakeholder agencies across multiple scales					
Planning documents acknowledge the need for alignment across scales					
Stakeholders can articulate common priorities and the mechanisms for alignment across scales					
Review of existing governance, power and decision-making structures in the countries and cities selected					
Do PFD and CP documents show sensitivity to the differences in existing governance, power and decision-making structures in countries and cities selected?					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
1.d To what extent does the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - provide additionality in terms of innovative approaches/processes/thinking and issues, compared to standard project approaches and previous programmatic approaches?			Program and Project Documents Key stakeholders of GEF, GEF Agencies, Conventions	Desk analysis	IEO Evaluator
Perceptions on coherence and integration	Relevance	Strategic		Project review protocol	Senior consultants
Frequency and quality of references to innovative approaches, processes and thinking				Interviews	Research analyst
Evidence of innovative approaches, processes and thinking in program design					
2. To what extent does IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - enable the GEF to fulfil its mandate vis-à-vis the Conventions?					
2.a To what extent does the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - demonstrate alignment with Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs)?			Program and Project Documents Key stakeholders GEF, GEF Agencies, Conventions	Desk analysis Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants
PFD and CP results frameworks contain outcome and impact indicators that contribute to multiple GEBs across GEF focal areas	Relevance	Strategic			
PFD and CP results frameworks contain GEB targets					
Level of complementarity between GEBs and local sustainability goals					
2.b To what extent does the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - promote synergies between Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)?			Program and Project Documents	Desk analysis Project review protocol	IEO Evaluator Research analyst
Focus on major drivers, in the PFD and CP documents, that promote synergies in implementing MEAs	Relevance	Strategic			
Concrete references in PFD and CP documents to the Conventions' major objectives					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
3. To what extent has the IAP integrated programming concept - as applied to the Cities IAP - harnessed the comparative strengths, advantages and unique selling points of the GEF Agencies, STAP, the GEF Secretariat and broader constituencies and partnerships?					
3. a To what extent are Lead and Implementing Agencies chosen based on comparative advantage?					
Good practice examples of World Bank leadership in coordination and partnerships: support through platforms, GPSC, capacity and partnerships	Relevance	Strategic, Process	Program and Project Documents	Desk analysis Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants
GEF facilitation of inter-agency collaboration in CP design and preparation			Sustainable cities / urban focused documentation of GEF Agencies		
Start-up efficiency and innovation of CP GEF agencies: project status and delays, compliance with partnership and administrative requirements (i.e. reporting)			Key stakeholders GEF, GEF Agencies		
World Bank's convening power across sectors and regions, its track-record in urban sustainability investments					
CP GEF Agencies' engagement in support of governments operational needs for urban development					
Involvement of CP GEF Agencies' in areas of urban and global sustainability relevant to Cities IAP					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
3.b To what extent is the GEF an opportune key partner with a comparative advantage for tackling urban sustainability issues?					
GEF has specialized technical capacity and track record to work on urban sustainability issues?	Relevance	Strategic, Process	Program and Project Documents Key stakeholders of GEF, GEF Agencies and STAP	Desk analysis Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants
GEF has specialized technical capacity and track record to work more holistically across different focal areas?					
GEF has institutional experience to work multi-institutionally and multi-scale (local, national, regional)					
GEF brings in grants to generate critical mass to address problems that are not covered by others?					
Good practice examples of GEF secretariat coordination in designing and launching Cities IAP					
STAP intellectual leadership and quality control over Cities IAP program design and review					
GEF's IAP financing to address global urban issues with multiplier effects by pooling with other co-financing sources					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
3.c How does the GEF and GEF Agencies engage with a broader constituency in Cities IAP design and start-up?			Program and Project Documents Key stakeholders of GEF, GEF Agencies, private sector and CSOs	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Have (in)formal public-private partnerships (PPPs) been developed as part of Cities IAP?	Relevance	Strategic, Process			
Has the private sector been engaged in the program and project design process?					
Have (in)formal partnerships been developed with civil society organizations as part of Cities IAP?					
Have CSOs been engaged with as part of the Cities IAP design and start-up?					
Concrete references in PFD and CP documents to engagement with and roles for private sector partners					
Concrete references in PFD and CP documents to engagement with and roles for CSOs					
Private and civil society partners can articulate common priorities and the mechanisms to be employed to ensure multi and cross sectoral alignment					
3.d To what extent does the GEF work in collaborative partnerships in Cities IAP design and start-up?			Program and Project Documents Key stakeholders of GEF, GEF Agencies and private sector	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
How has the private sector been involved in the Cities IAP design and start-up?	Relevance	Strategic, Process			
Has the private sector been considered as a partner in urban development and infrastructure?					
Arrangements in PFD and CP documents and budgets for partnering, collective action, new supportive policies and incentives, at program, project, country and regional level					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
4. To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into account in the Cities IAP design?					
4.a Gender: evidence of any gender analysis, gender disaggregated or sensitive indicators and targets in Cities IAP program and CP documents, or proof of other measures to address gender differences and promote gender equality?					
PFD and CP documents contain gender in the (1) context description, (2) partner description, (3) project description, and/or (4) gender specific objectives and activities?					
PFD and CP results frameworks and tracking tools contain (1) gender disaggregated indicators, and/or (2) gender specific indicators?			Program and Project Documents	Desk analysis	IEO Evaluator
Was a gender analysis, or social assessment with gender component, conducted at design?			M&E planning documents	Project review protocol	Senior consultants
Do the PFD and CP documents include a gender mainstreaming strategy or plan?		Process, Portfolio - Program and CP level	Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Online survey	Research analyst
Share of men and women involved in project design?				Interviews	
Share of men and women targeted as direct beneficiaries?					
To what extent were gender experts included in the projects' design and start-up?					
Quality at entry gender rating for the parent and CPs.					
Share of project cost for specific gender objectives or activities?					
Share of men and women identified in lead roles in program and project management					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
4. To what extent have gender and resilience been taken into account in the Cities IAP design?					
4.b Resilience: evidence of any strategic resilience analysis, resilience indicators and targets in Cities IAP program and CP documents?					
Resilience is used in the PFD and CP documents (1) as part of project risk management, (2) as a specific co-benefit, (3) resilience is integrated into a multiple benefits framework			Program and Project Documents	Desk analysis	IEO Evaluator
Resilience as used in the PFD and CP documents makes reference to (1) resilience in a more static system sense, (2) incremental adaptation, and (3) transformational changes			M&E planning documents	Project review protocol	
PFD and CP results frameworks and tracking tools contain resilience focused indicators?		Process, Portfolio - Program and CP level	Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Online survey Interviews	Senior consultants
Mention and/or use of RAPTA in PFD and CP documents					Research analyst
Mention and/or use of alternative resilience guidelines or tools in PFD and CP documents					
Share of project cost for specific resilience objectives or activities?					
Perceptions on usefulness, difficulty, actual use, etc. of resilience concept(s) (if applied) with involved stakeholders					
Perceptions on usefulness, difficulty, actual use, etc. of resilience tools used with involved stakeholders					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
5. How efficiently has the launch and design process of the Cities IAP program been, and what has been the buy-in by the target groups thus far?					
5.a Evidence of coherence and child projects-to-program integration in Cities IAP program design?					
Coherence in Objectives and design established across projects: number of CPs aligned	Relevance, Efficiency	Strategic, Process	Program and Project Documents Urban sustainability literature review Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Coherence of PFD with regard to international urban sustainability policies and best practices					
Global cross-cutting child project (hub) supports program integration through establishing three platforms: timing of platform establishment, demonstrated contributions during CP design, references to innovative ways in hub CP/platform design, content, and operation					
Alignment of objectives and priorities of PFD and country CPs and selection of participating cities					
Relevance of country CPs to local and national urban sustainability priorities as identified by GEF Agencies					
Quality of implementation arrangements of country CPs and their likelihood of attaining projected outputs and outcomes					
Potential of the GPSC (hub-project) as designed, launched and organized to function as the coordination mechanism for the Cities IAP					
Potential of Resource Team (RT) to interface the Cities IAP with global communities of practice in urban sustainability					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
5.b Evidence of coherence and integration of M&E common standards and baselines in Cities IAP projects and program's RBM and M&E design?					
PFD and CP have SMART indicators in results framework and tracking tools	Relevance	Strategic, Process, Portfolio - Program and Child Projects (CP)	Program and Project Documents M&E planning documents	Desk analysis Project review protocol	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Common standards for program/project monitoring and reporting developed					
Extent to which M&E baselines have been established or are being planned for CPs					
M&E burden for parent vis-à-vis CPs					
Coherence of Project Results Frameworks across the portfolio and with the GPSC (hub-project's) metrics					
5.c Program and project design modalities and costs					
Alignment, or the lack thereof, of co-financiers conditionalities with CP objectives and intended outcomes	Efficiency, Relevance	Strategic, Process, Portfolio - Program and Child Projects (CP)	Program and Project Documents Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies and STAP	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Program / project design was done in a consultative and participatory way					
PFD and CP design was sufficiently contextualized in specific country context					
Evidence for alignment of Cities IAP with the STAR resource allocation framework					
Evidence for the way that access to additional funding sources through STAR affected country willingness to participate in Cities IAP as compared with previous GEF projects					
Program concept development from STAP background paper to PFD via GEF secretariat and World Bank collaboration					
Were PPG amounts for project preparation and other mobilization of technical capacities sufficient for the program and project design?					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
5.d To what extent was country selection based on relevance and established criteria?					
Is the selection of target countries and target cities based on relevance?	Relevance	Strategic, Process, Portfolio - Program and Child Projects (CP)	Program and Project Documents Interviews GEF and GEF Agencies	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
PFD and CP design documents articulate a definition of 'relevance' for country / city selection. Or, were the criteria for selection suitably established?					
To what extent do PFD and CP design documents articulate the case for selection based on relevance?					
To what extent were the selected cities the most appropriate, based on their relevance / need for more sustainable urban development?					
# of CP documents reference MEAs					
# of CP documents reference to Cities IAP expected key results					
# of CP documents reference focal area strategies					
# of cities that are members of global cities coalitions					
# of CP documents that reference Paris Agreement; The Sendai and Addis Ababa Agreements and Habitat III					
Comparisons/ranking of development need found in program and project design documents					
Identified development need aligns with SDGs.					
GEF agency personnel can articulate and justify selection of cities based on comparative need with other cities' development needs					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
5.e Buy-in by target groups at project, country and regional level					
Engagement, ownership and buy-in are addressed in PFD and CP design documents					
Kind of engagement, ownership and buy-in articulated in PFD and CP design documents					
Perception of stakeholders on the consultation and participation processes, ownership and buy-in in program and CP design by GEF Agencies					
Stakeholders' role in project planning, management and delivery articulated in program and CP design documents			Program and Project Documents	Desk analysis	IEO Evaluator
Number and type of actions taken at this point at the project, country and regional level, i.e. designation of institutions, allocation of offices and staffs to CPs			Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Project review protocol	Senior consultants
Stakeholders committing personnel to the program and projects				Online survey	Research analyst
Stakeholders committing co-financing to the program and CPs				Interviews	
Stakeholders integrating Cities IAP program and project information into their strategic and planning documents					
Type of personnel assigned to and engaged in Cities IAP program and projects					
Stakeholders can articulate the nature of their involvement					
Stakeholders can articulate program vision, goals and objectives					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
6. Have funding sources been strategically allocated for integrated programming (i.e. GEF set-aside funding, co-financing leverage)?					
Are PPP's being examined as options for further implementation? Are PPP's being examined as funding source for further future financing?	Relevance, Efficiency	Process, Portfolio - Program and CP level	Program and Project Documents Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Role and sector contributions of private sector co-financing in country CPs					
Alignment of co-financiers priorities with CP objectives and intended outcomes					
GEF funding by programming direction as shown in PFD and CP documents					
Logic for GEF funding by programming direction					
Type of co-financiers (GEF Agency, other multi-lateral non-GEF agency, bilateral aid agency, foundation/trust fund, micro-finance institute, CSO/(I)NGO, national government, local/city government, private sector, beneficiaries, other, namely...) by programming direction in PFD and CP documents					
Type of co-financing modalities (in-kind, cash, grant, public investment, equity, concessional debt (25% grant component), loan, guarantee or risk-sharing instrument) by programming direction in PFD and CP documents					
Benefits and limitation of used co-financing modalities					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
7. To what extent are there mechanisms for broader adoption (mainstreaming, scale-up, replication, market transformation), features that enable knowledge capture and mechanisms for learning from previous projects?					
7.a To what extent are there mechanisms for broader adoption (mainstreaming, scale-up, replication, market transformation)?					
What is the envisaged role of the private sector in replication, scale up and further market transformation?	Relevance, Efficiency		Program and Project Documents Urban sustainability literature review Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Existing mechanisms for institutional capacity building mentioned in PFD and CP documents, covering enabling policy environment for broader adoption					
Existing mechanisms for scaling-up mentioned in PFD and CP documents.					
PFD and CP design documents demonstrate projects are drawing from lessons learnt from previous and on-going urban sustainability projects					
CPs promote further uptake by more cities nationally of urban sustainability approach as promoted by Cities IAP					
Consolidation of Cities IAP approach, in PFD, GEF-6 programming directions and linkages with GEF 2020 strategy, to ensure continuation beyond current commitments					

Key questions / indicators / what to look for	Evaluation criteria	Level	Sources of information	Methodology	Responsibility
7.b What are the design features enabling knowledge capture?			Program and Project Documents Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
Existing mechanisms for institutional capacity building in PFD and CP documents, covering effective knowledge and learning	Relevance, Efficiency				
Mechanisms for informed decision making in PFD and CP documents					
Potential of GPSC (hub-project) and RT (stand-alone resource project) to create opportunities for knowledge capture and dissemination among participating cities and beyond					
Potential of GEF Secretariat, WB and GEF agencies for integrating lessons learned through Cities IAP in their operational practices					
7.c How does the design ensure learning from previous projects incorporated in this project?			Program and Project Documents Interviews GEF, GEF Agencies, national and city government officials	Desk analysis Project review protocol Interviews	IEO Evaluator Senior consultants Research analyst
PFD and CP design documents include lessons learnt from previous PAs	Relevance, Efficiency				
Potential of GPSC (hub-project), based on PFD and CP documentation and interviews with stakeholders, to provide access to global experience					
Potential of GPSC (hub-project), based on PFD and CP documentation and interviews with stakeholders, to act as a conduit between country CPs and cities across participating countries					
Potential of RT (stand-alone resource project), based on PFD and CP documentation and interviews with stakeholders, to draw from a global platform of cases, references, examples and best practices that feed into implementation					