



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

GEF ID:	4766		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	Implementation of Eco-industrial Park Initiative for Sustainable Industrial Zones in Vietnam		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-1; IW-1; IW-2; CHEM-1; CHEM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,524,000
Co-financing:	\$14,151,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,675,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Heinz Leuenberger

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	AS 12/12/11 :Chemicals - Yes CA Jan/31/12: Yes for climate change.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	AS 12/12/11- Chemicals - Yes	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Please clarify how UNIDO will implement the hard and soft loans being put forward as part of the package for this project. AS Apr 9, 2012 - The investments are made mainly by the private industry.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The project team is preparing all loan applications. Technical and financial feasibility studies will be supported and monitored by an international expert selected by the project. The hard loans are managed by national banks, the green credit lines in Vietnam is managed by private banks which were selected by SECO several years ago. Staff of these banks was trained for these types of projects. Financial health of the companies is assessed by banks; all the loans are managed by banks or the Government of Vietnam. The environmental fund of Vietnam is managed by the Government of Vietnam.</p> <p>Comment Cleared</p>	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Yes	
Resource Availability	6. 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? 	AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - not applicable CA Jan/31/12. Yes for Climate Change	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 	N/A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Yes CA 1/31/12- CCM - The project is aligned with objective CCM-1. Please describe further alignment with CCM-1, i.e., innovative technologies introduced through this project have not been adopted in the Vietnamese market.</p> <p>AS Apr 9 2012 - Comment Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Yes A 1/31/12 - CCM - Please address comment in box 7.</p> <p>AS Apr 9 2012 - Comment Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Yes CA 1/31/12 - CCM - No. The PIF makes zero reference to the National Communication, nor does it take into account the substance of the ongoing Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) work. Please review the National Communication document and utilize its findings as a basis for this project. Also, please consult with TNA stakeholders to ensure consistency with the identified technology needs/sector prioritization.</p> <p>IZ - IW: Consistency with National Action Programme (NAP) related to the South China Sea SAP and/or to the MEkong River Basin SAP needs to be identified and documented.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised -</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Comment Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Yes CA Jan/31/12 - CCM - Not fully. Please describe the sustainability of operations of the partners (such as the Vietnam NCPC) in the field of climate change.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - Comment Cleared</p>	
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>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - There is no discernable baseline project described. In itself the development of a plan that this project seeks to create is a baseline project. CA Jan/31/12 - CCM - Similar to the chemicals comment, please describe the baseline project and its relevance for climate change mitigation.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - 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>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - There is no basis to judge this without the elaboration of a baseline project.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised -</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Comment Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Please clarify how the demonstration projects envisaged will be carried out. Will an entire IZ be worked with and implemented as a result of the project? What are the expected reductions in D&F emissions from this project?</p> <p>It is not clear if some industries in an existing industrial zone will be converted to better environmentally performing industries or all of the industries will be converted.</p> <p>IZ - IW</p> <p>a/ In order to be eligible under GEF 5 IW Strategy Obj. 1 and/or 2, the PIF should document that the project addresses at least one of transboundary concerns identified in SCS or Mekong RB TDAs and contribute to implementation of one or more measures identified in relevant adopted SAP(s). If demonstrations on pilot sites are envisaged then stress reduction outputs and indicators need to be associated with those.</p> <p>b/ certain amount (1%) of IW budget needs to be dedicated to IW:Learn activities: webpage following the IW:Learn guidelines, production of Experience Note(s), participation to the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF IW Conference</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - Comment Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Will consider after the elaboration of a baseline project.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - 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>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - for chemicals/IW there would be a benefit in the local communities from reduced exposure to emissions from an eco-IZ should such a park be developed. It is not clear if an entire zone or only a few industries would be affected from this project.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed - Comment Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - The list provided in the PIF sufficiently describes a wide range of stakeholders and their roles.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>		
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - please clearly how this project will build on and supplement the UNDP project in Vietnam.</p> <p>CA 1/31/12 - CCM - please describe in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>detail how this project will coordinate with (and are differentiated from) other existing projects involving the NCPC and other partners. Also, please clarify how the project and the TNA project will link.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - Comment Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	AS 12/12/11 - Chemicals - Yes	
	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?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No. The cost being asked is too high and the justification that it is a multifocal area is not sufficient. The project proposes looking at an industrial zone in an integrated approach so that the PMU can be developed accordingly and within the guideline of less 5% for projects exceeding 2M of GEF resources.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - Comment Cleared</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>No.</p> <p>AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - Comment Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The co-financing is below what is expected. AS Apr 9, 2012 - The comments have been addressed and the PIF revised - Comment Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	yes	
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?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	None Received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None Received	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None Received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Please clarify comments. AS Apr 9, 2012 - Yes	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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*	February 01, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.