



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

GEF ID:	9890		
Country/Region:	Myanmar		
Project Title:	Myanmar Rural Renewable Energy Development Programme		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5564 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3 Program 5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,934,228
Co-financing:	\$33,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$37,934,228
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	9/6/2017 MY: Not at this time. The project is aligned with CCM Objective 1, Program 1: Promote the timely development, demonstration, and financing of low-carbon technologies and policies. Please revise the content in Table A on page 1. 9/28/2017, DER: Comment cleared.	9/25/17 Noted this was adjusted in Table A on page 1
	2. Is the project consistent with the	9/6/2017 MY:	

¹ 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
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, this project is consistent to Myanmar's Nationally Determined Contributions and the National Communications to the UNFCCC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	9/6/2017 MY: Yes, it is stated on pages 6-7.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	9/6/2017 MY: Not clear yet at this time. Please use Table 2 to show how this proposed GEF project will generate incremental benefits over the existing baseline projects that are listed in Table 2. The Agency may need to add two columns in Table 2, one to show the major outputs of the existing baseline projects and another to show the outputs of the proposed GEF project. 9/28/2017 DER: Comment cleared.	9/25/2017 Table 2 was revised to explain the incremental value of this proposed GEF project over the ongoing initiatives and projects as can be found in the PIF on pages 14, 15 and 16 .
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	9/6/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please specifically add numbers to each of targeted outputs. For example, in output 2.3, please specify and add the number of developed and completed trainings; please also add the number of people to be trained in each of the training programs. Please	9/25/2017 Response: 1) Table B explains the number of trainings; number of people and number of trainers being trained for each of the suggested training activities: - Village electricity committees and community representatives will be trained during 4 years on various aspects

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>consider training trainers who will further train the local civilians.</p> <p>Output 2.7 is actually not INV. Please design a component for tangible investment in this project. For example, in terms of capacity building by training, the agency may work with the national government to build or develop a training center in rural renewable energy development if there is not such a center.</p> <p>Again, Component 3 is not really on tangible investments. Please consider tangible renewable energy technology demonstration under the refined policy and capacity development.</p> <p>9/28/2017 DER: Comments cleared. At CEO endorsement stage we expect further details on the specific tangible investments that will be targeted. We also expect an options analysis for component 3.7 that explains the type of financial solution that will be designed that is sensitive and responsive to market conditions. The goal should be to use scarce GEF investment dollars to accelerate commercial RE deals.</p>	<p>of rural RE by means of 4 trainings per year per states with 30 to 50 participants per training (960 to 1600 people in total). Train the trainers training will be organized to have a pool of 80 trainers by EOP in each state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RE developers, installers and service providers will be trained during 4 years by means of 3 trainings per year, with 30 to 50 participants per training (360 to 600 people in total). - Installers and service providers will be trained on standard compliance and quality certification by means of 3 trainings per year during 4 years with 30 to 50 participants per training (in total 360 to 600 people). <p>2) The INV was inadvertently misplaced in the original PIF, this has now been corrected by indicating the INV of 1,000,000 USD for activity 2.9 in order to establish an RE technology testing facility</p> <p>3) Component 3 has tangible renewable energy technology demonstration in activity 3.6 where it is aimed for to design and build "Operational RE systems with total installed capacity at least 15 MW for communities (e.g. solar, wind power, micro and mini-hydro and waste-to-energy)". Given the high economic costs</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>of energy in rural areas and the continuously decreasing costs of several RE technologies, the expectation is that there are possibilities for rural RE development on market based principles. However several policy, regulatory, capacity and access to finance barriers may be preventing this to happen. During the PPG phase, the project will therefore use the UNDP's De-risking Renewable Energy Investment (DREI) methodology to come to a full assessment of the barriers to be addressed. Especially access to finance is perceived as a main barrier for which the project aims to set up an appropriate financial support mechanism (activity 3.7), complemented by the use of government funds that were previously assigned to the "100% RE subsidy" scheme. Once the DREI analysis (during the PPG phase) has indicated the exact need for such support, an appropriate financial support mechanism will be designed. Table B / Component 3/Activity 3.7 explains this.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	9/6/2017 MY: Yes, it is stated on page 24.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	9/6/2017 MY: Yes. Myanmar is an LDC. Its STAR	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		allocation is not affected.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	9/6/2017 MY: Yes. Myanmar is an LDC. Its CCM allocation is not affected.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	9/6/2017 MY: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	9/6/2017 MY: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	9/6/2017 MY: N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>9/6/2017 MY: Not at this time. Please address comments in Boxes: 1, 4 and 5.</p> <p>9/28/2017 DER: All comments cleared. the Program manager recommends technical clearance.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement stage we expect further details on the specific tangible investments that will be targeted. We also expect an options analysis for component 3.7 that explains the type of financial solution that will be designed that is sensitive and responsive to market conditions. The goal should be to use scarce GEF investment dollars to accelerate commercial RE deals.</p>	
Review Date	Review	September 06, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 28, 2017	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	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 measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ 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.