



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

GEF ID:	9219		
Country/Region:	Thailand		
Project Title:	Applications of Industry-Urban Symbiosis and Green Chemistry for Low Emission and Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)-Free Industrial Development in Thailand		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1; CW-1 Program 1; CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,966,000
Co-financing:	\$59,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$68,166,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	Jerome Stucki

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 August 13 2015</p> <p>Thailand has not signed nor ratified the Minamata Convention on Mercury, and activities related with mercury are not eligible.</p> <p>The project on climate change mitigation, SAICM and POPs is aligned with CCM Objective 1, Program 1 and CW Objective 1</p>	Mercury related activities were excluded from the project. The proposed budget was re-calculated and reduced as a result.

<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
		<p>,Program 1 and CW Objective 2, Program 2.</p> <p>MO September 23, 2015 comment cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>MO August 13, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Thailand has implemented Alternative Energy Development Plan, and Energy Efficiency Development Plan. It also introduced Green Growth Strategy to promote sustainable production and service.</p>	
<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 August 13, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The industry sector is the largest emitter of GHG in Thailand. High POPs pollution have been measured in the environment, especially in industrialized area and more densely populated area.</p> <p>The project will assess and adopt market-based instrument including incentives for companies to reduce pollution.</p> <p>This project will promote sustainable industrial zone, after the first GEF project in Vietnam, by introducing</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		energy efficiency and renewable energy (solar and waste to energy), and green chemistry which use substitution of POPS by less harmful substances.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MO August 13, 2015 Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MO August 13, 2015  Table F Please revise targets of CO2 and mercury in the Table F. The activities related with mercury is not eligible. Also we do not expect to implement hazardous waste disposal in cement kiln, as well as CO2 emission reduction through this activity (see below).  Output 1.3; a) National scale material flow analysis is not eligible. Also analysis not related with POPs and energy should be supported by co-financing.  b) It is not clear whether this component will contribute pilot demonstration in Component 3. Please revise the activities and include more practical results such as partnerships and collaboration of stakeholders and , identification of clean and low carbon technology needed and available BAT/BET,	Table F has been modified to reflect the exclusion of the mercury component from the proposed project. In terms of CO2 emissions, these were previously calculated without the inclusion of CO2 emissions reduction via cement kiln. Thus, the figures were not changed. Output 1.3: a) The project suggests carrying out a material/substance flow analysis (MFA/SFA) on new POPs and hazardous chemicals in the three targeted provinces to identify the material and energy use and POPs releases to the environment. b) This component has been expanded on page 11, describing clean and low carbon technology solutions. BAT/BET options are specified in more detail on page 12. All elements in terms of waste disposal in cement industry were excluded from the proposed project. The areas of cooperation with the Cleantech project (GEF ID 5800) are outlined on pages 7 and 19.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>through the use of relevant data of POPs, energy use etc.. Please see component 3 of eco-industrial part project in Vietnam.</p> <p>Output 1.5; Please explain how BAT/BET will be implemented to avoid UPOPs pollution through the project, especially in waste to energy plant.</p> <p>Please do not implement hazardous waste disposal in cement industry. We are very concerned that robust regulation and pollution control system are yet implemented so that it may cause pollution such as U-POPs. (page 14, second paragraph).</p> <p>Coordination; Please explain how the project will coordinate with the project Cleantech Program for SMEs in Thailand (ID 5800).</p> <p>MO September 23, 2015 1) Please explain BAT/BET options for POPs from e-waste (output1.3). 2) Please delete hazardous waste disposal in cement kiln (Annex 2)</p> <p>MO October 2, 2015</p>	<p>Response September 29, 2015</p> <p>1) The BAT/BEP options for e-waste management under Output 1.3 have been added and will be introduced according to the respective BAT/BEP Guidelines of the Stockholm Convention.</p> <p>2) Hazardous waste disposal in cement kiln was excluded from Annex 2.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Availability of Resources</b>		Comments cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO August 13, 2015 Yes.	
	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 August 13, 2015  The request for CCM resources is within the STAR allocation and the focal area allocation. A letter of endorsement signed August 10, 2015 was submitted with the project.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MO August 13 2015 Thailand is not eligible for mercury related activities. Please see box 1. Please revise the Table A, B and D according to the revision of activities (please see box 5). Additionally please check all the amount in the Table. there are several miscalculation.  MO September 23, 2015 comment cleared.	Mercury related activities are excluded from the proposed project. All the tables were recalculated to reflect the corrected amount.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional	MO August 13, 2015 Not at this time. Please address	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>comments in box 1, 5 and 7.</p> <p>MO September 23, 2015 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 5.</p> <p>MO October 1, 2015 All comments cleared. Program manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	August 13, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 23, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 01, 2015	

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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> 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)		

<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.