



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

GEF ID:	5087		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Organic Waste Streams for Industrial Renewable Energy Applications in India		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3; CCM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,333,000
Co-financing:	\$18,215,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,548,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Mark Draeck

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes, an endorsement letter was signed by OFP Mr. Pande in the amount of \$3,737,800.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	HT, August 28, 2012: There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

		Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes, it is aligned with CCM-3, especially using indigenous renewable sources such as biomass.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	HT, August 28, 2012: Please address the following comment. a) Please refer to the latest UNFCCC National Communication which was submitted by the Government of India in May, 2012. b) This project is not included in the list of prioritized projects in the Indian National Portfolio Formulation Document. Please explain the content of discussion between the UNIDO and the Indian Government in developing this proposal. HT, September 18, 2012 a) The revised PIF has referred to the latest National Communications. Comment cleared. b) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed if any	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes, the proposal includes knowledge	

	of project outcomes?	development of sustainable replication model.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: Not clear. Please explain what activities are planned without GEF financing.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 Does the explanation mean co-financing is for large-scale industries? Please explain what activities in each component will be covered by co-financing.</p> <p>HT, September 24, 2012: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: This will be examined after receiving responses to the comments for other items.</p> <p>HT, September 24, 2012: Yes.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: Not clear. Please address the following comments.</p> <p>a) The project aims to convert organic waste to energy. What kind of energy (ex. heat) is targeted as a result of conversion? Please explain.</p> <p>Component 2: b) The PIF proposes a cluster approach. Please explain how to establish a system to collect waste</p>	

		<p>degrades the quality of waste as resources and makes handling more difficult. How will the project address this challenge? Please explain.</p> <p>Component 4: d) What kind of incentive schemes are envisaged? Please clarify.</p> <p>Component5: e) Activities listed in Component 5 should be implemented by the UNIDO and covered by Project Management Cost and Agency fee. Please revise it.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 a) b) c) d) e) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: While the Project Framework proposes 10 to 15 applications (page 2), the GHG reduction calculation (footnote 10 on page 10) assumes 7 pilot plants. Please explain.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 The inconsistency has been corrected. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: Please explain the roles of the industry sector which generates and makes use of waste.</p>	

		Explanation has been corrected. Comment cleared.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	HT, August 28, 2012: In implementing the project, sanitary management of organic waste will be required. In addition, biochemical processes to convert waste to energy could cause a nasty smell. Please include these environmental risks and mitigation measures. HT, September 18, 2012 Please add the risk level of the environmental risk. HT, September 24, 2012: Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, August 28, 2012: Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	HT, August 28, 2012: Please explain how to coordinate with the industry sector which generates and makes use of waste. HT, September 18, 2012 Explanation has been corrected. Comment cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project	HT, August 28, 2012:	

Project Financing		<p>and make sure that the percentage of the Project Management Cost (PMC) before PMC is 5 % or less.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 Comment cleared.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: Please address the comment in box 14 e).</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 Comment cleared.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: In Table C, several Ministries as co-financers are categorized into "Local Government." Is this true? Please check it.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 Table C has been corrected. Comment cleared.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: UNIDO is providing \$150,000, which is 0.8 % of the total co-financing. This amount does not reflect its role in the project. Please consider to increase the co-financing by UNIDO.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 Explanation has been provided. If PIF is cleared, please explore the possibility to increase the co-financing by UNIDO. Comment cleared.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>HT, August 28, 2012: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments.</p> <p>HT, September 18, 2012 Please address the comments in box 11 and 18.</p> <p>HT, September 24, 2012: The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>HT, September 24, 2012: Please address the following items at the CEO Endorsement stage:</p> <p>a) Detailed descriptions of the baseline project and incremental reasoning; b) Concrete plan of the demonstration component, in particular waste collection system and homogeneity of waste; and c) A sound and appropriate description of GHG emissions reduction and cost-effectiveness.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 28, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 18, 2012	

	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	HT, September 24, 2012: Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	HT, September 24, 2012: Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	HT, August 28, 2012: Not recommended before the recommendation of the PIF. HT, September 24, 2012: PPG will be recommended after the PIF is included in a Work Program.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 24, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.