



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9830</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Myanmar</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Climate Change Mitigation through Methane Recovery and Reuse from Industrial Wastewater Treatment</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-1 Program 1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$125,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,984,589</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$19,105,322</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$23,089,911</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2017</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Masako Ogawa</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jerome Stucki</b>

### PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>MO June 8, 2017 The project is not aligned with CCM2 Program3, because it will not target the whole urban planning. It rather aims to improve waste water treatment technologies and its relevant activities by local governments. Please revise Table A.</p> <p>MO July 6 2017 Comment cleared.</p>	Table A was revised accordingly .
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient	<p>MO June 8, 2017 Myanmar submitted its INDC to UNFCCC secretariat on September 28, 2015. <a href="http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/indc/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx">http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/indc/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx</a></p>	The project aims to support

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p><a href="http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Myanmar/1/Myanmar's%20INDC.pdf">http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Myanmar/1/Myanmar's%20INDC.pdf</a></p> <p>(1) PIF discusses that UN-Habitat is working to develop INDC. Please clarify the status of the INDC and what is the relation with the INDC already submitted in 2015.</p> <p>(2) Please provide the information on how the project aligns with and contributes to implementation of the INDC. Please document how project activities align with specific priorities, measures or policies in the INDC, or if the INDC is at a general level, please describe alignment using the INDC.</p> <p>MO July 6 2017 Comments cleared.</p>	Myanmar under its actions set-out in the INDC in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2. This was further described in Section 6 of the PIF.
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MO June 8, 2017 Please clarify if this project will support revision of the urban planning. Page 14 discusses "enhanced city planning", but the only the activity 1.1.2.4 will work on road maps for city planning. Please clarify what is the enhanced city planning in page 14.</p> <p>MO July 6 2017 Comment cleared.</p>	The aspect of consulting with city planners is explained in more detail in the indicated section.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MO June 8, 2017 Please do not include IFC as co-financing partner in Table C unless the communications that confirm IFC is a willing partner can be documented.</p> <p>MO July 6 2017 Comment cleared.</p>	This was changed accordingly.

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MO June 8, 2017</p> <p>(1) Output 1.1.1 includes "institutional capacity on sound wastewater management strengthened". Please clarify which activities will support this output and which institutions will be strengthened.</p> <p>(2) Output 1.1.2 discusses that PPG will identify the most suitable industrial parks. Please clarify if this process is same with the activity discussed in page 10 ("During PPG phase the industrial zones and companies .. will be identified").</p> <p>(3) Output 1.1.3 will implement capacity development for local governments. Please explain how training on EMA, EMS, low-carbon technologies and related topics for SMEs and industrial parks managers will be implemented.</p> <p>(4) Cost-effectiveness of the project is relatively small (11.4 - 20.3 \$/ton including indirect emission reduction). Please explain how the project will include GEBs through reduction of methane emission.</p> <p>MO July 6 2017 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>(1) The aspect of institutional capacity building was further detailed in Section 3 of the PIF.</p> <p>(2) Correct, Output 1.1.2 reflects the process indicated on page 10.</p> <p>(3) The training approach and modality is explained in more detail in the indicated section.</p> <p>(4) The data will be verified and finalized during the PPG phase. Further explanation</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			s are provided in the PIF under Section 4.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO June 8, 2017 Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	MO June 8, 2017 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area</li> </ul>		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	allocatio n?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptat ion or Technol ogy Transfer )?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation s</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommende d for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MO June 8, 2017 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 1 - 5.</p> <p>MO July 6, 2017 All comments cleared. Program manager recommends PIF clearance. Cost-efficiency is still low. Please improve during project preparation period.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	June 08, 2017	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 06, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		