

# Promoting the transition to a circular economy in Uruguay through cleantech innovations

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10453

**Countries**

Uruguay

**Project Name**

Promoting the transition to a circular economy in Uruguay through cleantech innovations

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

6/18/2021

**Review completed by PM**

10/15/2021

**Program Manager**

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

**Agency Response**  
**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**No.** The GEF Sec has reviewed the budget excel sheet and has found the following inconsistencies:

- There is an error in cell Q124, the sum shouldn't include cell Q116, it shall include only cells Q102, Q40 and Q74.

- The total sum of all M&E costs shall be 30k instead of 32k. Please correct.

- As per the excel sheet, UNIDO is charging a total of \$43,290 on treasury and payment services. Kindly note that as per the GEF Guidelines ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF\\_C.59\\_Inf.03\\_Guidelines%20on%20the%20Project%20and%20Program%20Cycle%20Policy.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_C.59_Inf.03_Guidelines%20on%20the%20Project%20and%20Program%20Cycle%20Policy.pdf)) the implementing agency cannot charge costs to a national child project. Please remove UNIDO costs from the budget and update the excel sheet accordingly.

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- Number under Cell Q124 still seems incorrect. This cell shall show the total cost of the M&E activities, which as per the table provided under Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" is \$64,000 while cell Q122 shows \$62,000 and cell Q124 \$30,000. Please correct to make the excel sheet and Table under Section 9 consistent. Also, Section 9 includes \$2,000 covered by PMC. Kindly note that PMC are not considered M&E and as such shall be removed from table under Section 9.

- Update the Implementation Start Date (currently as of 9/1/2021) to give ample time for the CEO Endorsement to be finalized and the GEF internal clearance and approval processes to be completed.

**PM 10/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**PM 10/22/2021:**

**No.** The Executing Agency seems to be a non-governmental organization (NGO). Please confirm whether this is the case and if so update accordingly in the introduction data at the beginning of the CEO Approval Request (i.e. GEF Portal Entry).

**PM 11/3/2021:**

**Cleared.**

## Agency Response

### Agency response 27 Oct 2021

The Executing Agency (Technological Laboratory of Uruguay, LATU) is best categorised as "government". LATU is a non-state public law organization created in 1965, and its establishment was based on Law N°. 13,318 of 12/28/1964 and is governed by the provisions included in this law. As an organization, it has assumed an articulating role, sharing projects with other public and private organizations, operating as a technical arm of the Government of Uruguay, working in cooperation with the academy and international organizations. LATU is also a control institution that receives instructions and authorizations from the executive branch of the government. The board of directors is chaired by a representative of the Ministry of Industry Energy and Mining (MIEM), and also from one representative each from the Uruguayan Chamber of Industries (CIU) and the Banco República (BROU). Paragraph 2 of section 6 on institutional arrangement and coordination is revised to include additional details on LATU.

### Agency response 30 Sep 2021

- The sum of M&E cost (former cell Q124, now cell R125 due to minor reformatting) in the budget table (Annex E) is corrected to USD 62,000.
- Section 9 of the CEO endorsement document is corrected as per the instructions.
- Implementation start date is changed to 1 Jan 2022.

-----  
- Cell Q124 of Annex E is corrected to \$32,000, and is the sum of Q40, Q74 and Q102.

- Cell Q121 is corrected to \$30,000, which corresponds to the cost of the terminal evaluation (output 3.2.2). The total sum of M&E cost of \$62,000 is mentioned in cell Q122 and D162 to fully capture all activities associated with M&E including the mid-term and final evaluations. The amount of independent evaluation (output 3.2.2) is separately mentioned in cell Q121.

- Please note that previously UNIDO charged \$1,290 to the project as treasury and payment services (direct service costs), as agreed with the GEF Secretariat. Based on a more recent discussion held in August 2021, this amount is removed from the project and reallocated to PMC to be spent by the national PEE. All text related to direct service costs are also removed.

Of the remaining \$42,000 allocated for UNIDO expenditure, \$12,000 is for activity 3.2.1.3 "Conduct an external mid-term review" and \$30,000 is for activity 3.2.2.1 "Conduct an external, independent terminal evaluation".

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- In "Table 2 - Comparison of the budget allocation (USD) to project components between the child project concept and the request for CEO approval", the total co-financing amount is wrong. It shall be \$9,827,100 instead of 9,777,1000. Please correct.

- Also in Table 2 under PMC costs and column "Description of change" states the following "Negligible change in GEF budget allocation". As per the table, the change has been on the co-financing amount instead of GEF budget. Please update accordingly.

- The co-financing amount has decreased considerable (from \$15 million to almost \$10 million) compared to the estimates at child project concept. However, given the nature of the project, further co-financing is expected to be mobilized during the implementation of the project. Please report to the GEF Sec any future pledges of co-financing during the implementation of the project.

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**PM 10/22/2021:**

**No. Please address the following comments:**

- PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10.0%, for a co-financing of \$9,087,100 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$908,710 instead of \$740,000 (which is 8%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

- Co-financing : Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mines \$100,000 cash contribution: change ?recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment mobilized?.

**PM 11/3/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**Agency Response**

**Agency response 27 Oct 2021**

- In line with this advice, PMC from the co-financing contribution is adjusted to 908,710USD. Co-financing amounts for outputs 3.1.2 and 3.2.1 are revised accordingly. These changes were discussed with and confirmed by counterparts.

- The co-financing category is changed to "investment mobilised" as advised.

-----

- Total co-financing amount in Table 2 is corrected to read \$9,827,100.

- ?Description of change? for PMC has been updated to read ?There is no change in the GEF project financing. PMC co-financing has increased to cover additional management costs.?

- Mobilisation of co-financing, especially investment into cleantech solutions will continue during the project implementation as investment facilitation is one of the key support services to be provided under component 2. The PMU will report on the additional mobilization of co-financing through the annual GEF PIRs (Project

Implementation Reports), as well as in the mid-term review, and the terminal evaluation. Therefore section 9, paragraph 2 is updated to read as below:

2. The Project Result Framework (Annex A) provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation/execution along with their corresponding means of verification. The actual progress will be reported against the work plan approved by the PSC. In case there are significant deviations between the forecasted workplan and actual implementation, corrective measures will need to be taken. By making reference to the impact and performance indicators defined in the Project Results Framework, the monitoring plan will track, report on and review project activities and accomplishments in relation to the energy savings achieved and GHGs emission reductions generated as a result of the project. The PMU will be responsible for continuous monitoring of project activities implementation, and performance. The PMU will be responsible for tracking overall project milestones and progress towards the attainment of the set project outputs and will also be responsible for narrative reporting to the GEF. Co-financing mobilisation efforts and results will also be monitored and reported on through the M&E plan, including through the annual GEF PIRs. The GEF OFP will be engaged in the M&E activities, such as regularly receiving all project progress reports, and providing inputs and comments, etc.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?  
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes, with request for clarifications.** Given that one of the prioritized sectors is Power-to-X, we are wondering whether the project activities will be saving energy. Please clarify and, if applicable, report on Indicator "6.3. Energy Saved" accordingly.

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**No.** While we understand the Global Environmental Benefits to be achieved will depend on the type of technology finally selected to receive support by the project, at the CEO Endorsement state the Agency shall provide a quantitative estimation on the core indicators to be achieved by the project. This estimation shall describe the assumptions made which shall be based on the expected pipeline of projects. Please provide estimations on core indicators 6.3 ?Energy saved? and 6.4 ?Increase in installed RE capacity? if these are to be reported by the project.

**PM 10/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

Agency response 30 Sep 2021

Target of 914,400,000 MJ of energy savings is provided as indicator 6.3. For details on the assumptions and calculations, please refer to revised para. 167 of the section on GEBs.

-----

The project is likely to be able to report on core indicators 6.3 ?Energy saved? and also 6.4 ?Increase in installed RE capacity?, depending on the types of technologies selected to receive support from the project. Please note that the exact technology categories of the Accelerator will be determined during the finalization of selection criteria, and therefore it is not possible at this point in time to set a target for energy saved.



The screening criteria for selection of technologies/solutions to receive support from this project will comprehensively assess the potential for contributing to GEBs . The monitoring and tracking of GEBs achieved (including energy saved and RE installed) will be part of the M&E plan both at the programmatic and project levels, and will be reported through the project's Annual Impact Reports, as well as through the annual PIRs.

Therefore paragraph 2 of section 9 is also updated as below:

2. The Project Result Framework (Annex A) provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation/execution along with their corresponding means of verification. The actual progress will be reported against the work plan approved by the PSC. In case there are significant deviations between the forecasted workplan and actual implementation, corrective measures will need to be taken. By making reference to the impact and performance indicators defined in the Project Results Framework, the monitoring plan will track, report on, and review project activities and accomplishments in relation to GEBs including the energy savings achieved and GHGs emission reductions generated as a result of the project. The PMU will be responsible for continuous monitoring of project activities implementation, and performance. The PMU will be responsible for tracking overall project milestones and progress towards the attainment of the set project outputs and will also be responsible for narrative reporting to the GEF. Co-financing mobilisation efforts and results will also be monitored and reported on through the M&E plan, including through the annual GEF PIRs. The GEF OFP will be engaged in the M&E activities, such as regularly receiving all project progress reports, and providing inputs and comments, etc.

## **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**No.** Paragraph 150 states that "the project is designed in consistency with the Program 1, Technology Transfer: Promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies". Please clarify which Program 1 is this referring to. If not clear, please remove and just keep the following "This project is designed in consistency with the first objective of the GEF-7 Climate Change Focal Area Strategy, i.e. to promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs, as indicated in the Report of the 54th GEF Council Meeting, Summary of Negotiations of the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (Document GEF/C.54/19/Rev.03), from 24-26 June 2018 (p.49)".

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response Thank you for the comment. Paragraph 150 is revised as advised.

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes, with request for clarifications.** The project document will benefit from an in depth explanation on what is innovative and different in this new GCIP project compared to the previous GCIP project implemented in Uruguay. What are the innovative features of the proposed project? How will the new features help achieve scalability?

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response Thank you for the comment. This project is the first project in Uruguay to employ the GCIP approach. This project builds on UNIDO's expertise and insights gained through implementing GCIP in 9 other countries between 2013 and 2019, which were integral in the design of this project's component 2 and 3. For further description on scalability and sustainability, please refer to part II 1a, section g on ?Innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up?.

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes, with request for clarifications.** Although quite exhaustive, the private sector has been barely mentioned/consulted. The private sector will play a key role in adopting the new clean technologies, and as such further clarification on the project has/will engaged them shall be provided. The same applies to the financial sector. Adequate financial instruments and credit access have been identified previously as key barriers for the development of the project. Since most of the proposed investment activities will require private sector financing, the project shall engage financiers and banks to ensure they understand the benefits and risks of the proposed cleantech. Financial entities are key for Output 1.1.4 Financial mechanism (1) designed to promote investments in circular economy and low GHG emission technologies

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response Thank you for the comment. Indeed, private sector engagement will be essential to achieving the overall objective of this project, especially for adopting the new technologies, and for investment facilitation. To ensure robust engagement of the private sector, the Project Steering Committee and the Project Management Unit will coordinate permanently with the private sector through institutions and organizations that group companies by sector, and directly through specialized technicians, through registries made up of professionals who provide services to companies. Examples include the Uruguayan Association of Renewable Energy (AUDER) and the Chamber of Industries of Uruguay (CIU). Potential role of AUDER and CIU in the stakeholder engagement matrix has been updated to highlight this. In addition, it is expected that more industry associations in all related sectors including meat, pork, fruits and vegetables, dairy, others. Please also see the updated section 4 on "Private Sector Engagement".

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**No.** Please see questions above on stakeholders.

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of section 4 on 'Private Sector Engagement' are updated to better describe how the project will engage with the private sector.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes, with request for clarification.** Capacity of financial institutions related to cleantech and innovative technologies seems to be an important risk for the development of the project. Please clarify if it is indeed relevant, and if so update the proposal accordingly.

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. The capacity and interest of financial institutions to invest in cleantech and circular economy solutions are indeed key elements in successfully supporting innovative solutions towards commercialization.

Risk assessment for 'Incentive and financial support system are insufficient?' (row 8 of the risk table) is updated as below:

The capacity and interest of financial institutions to invest in cleantech and circular economy solutions are key elements in successfully supporting innovative solutions towards commercialization. Therefore, the project will seek linkages to other financing schemes for clean energy technology promotion from the onset, including Uruguay's Renewable Energy Innovation Fund (REIF) approved by SDG UN Fund. Through the

GCIP network, the Uruguayan start-up/SME will benefit from exposure to national, regional and global investors and potential customers/partners. In addition, the project will design a financial mechanism to promote investments in circular economy and low GHG emission technologies (output 1.1.4).

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes, with further request for clarification.** See comment above. The M&E budget under Section 9 of the CEO Endorsement document is not consistent with the M&E costs as per the excel sheet budget. Please make these numbers consistent.

**PM 10/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**No.** Please elaborate further on the socioeconomic benefits and how these benefits will help achieve the GEB identified earlier.

**PM 9/15/2021:**



**Cleared.**

### Agency Response

In summary, the project yields the following socioeconomic benefits as a result of supporting and introducing new cleaner technologies into the market, strengthening national institutional capabilities, enhancing the availability of financial instruments, and encouraging inclusivity in the entrepreneurial and job markets. Specifically these interventions lead to:

1. Enhancement of human capital

Entrepreneurial, environmental and technological skills development and awareness raising have the effect of a larger number of cleantech products being commercialized and entering the market. Better decisions are made by entrepreneurs regarding the sustainability and life cycle approach to the products and businesses.

2. Local product development and production with job creation, generating more income

Fostering new local technologies lowers costs benefiting both the technology developer and end-user and encourages consumers to buy more efficient products and have a great benefit from this technological change.

3. An enriched innovation ecosystem

The high quality institutions attract the build confidence in local and foreign investors as well as the small business community in an economy due to low volume of transactions costs that result in the advancement of environment friendly technologies.

4. Promotion of women and youth entrepreneurial development and job creation

The promotion of gender and youth inclusion and mainstreaming in a country tends to be productive, innovative and creative for problem solution so it is an advantage to obtain environmental targets. Mainstreaming diversity will encourage the cooperation and cohesion of people in advocating for environmentally beneficial practices and products.

### Annexes

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**No.** In the budget tables under Annex E of the CEO Endorsement document, please add a short description of the activities (no just the number) to facilitate the assessment of which budget categories (civil works, contractual services, consultants, salaries, etc.) are charged to which sources (project's components, M&E, PMC).

**PM 10/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response  
Agency response 30 Sep 2021

- Budget summary uploaded as part of the CEO endorsement document is revised. It now includes requested details including short descriptions of the activities in correspondence with the full budget table (excel file submitted as Annex E).

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

**PM 9/15/2021:**

**No.** The Project Results Framework is off the margin. Please fix it.

**PM 10/15/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**PM 10/22/2021:**

**No.** Please include GEF Core Indicator 11 (Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment) in Annex A. "Project Results Framework" with appropriate targets. Please also

mark GEF core indicators as such (?GEF Core Indicator 11?, ?GEF Core Indicator 6?) in Annex A ? this will be very helpful for results monitoring.

**PM 11/3/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

**Agency response 27 Oct 2021**

The number of direct beneficiaries (gender disaggregated) is included as a key indicator in Annex A. GEF core indicators 6 and 11 are marked in Annex A as advised. Number of directly beneficiaries (core indicator 11) is adjusted to 390 to correct a previous calculation error.

-----  
Agency response 30 Sep 2021

The project results framework was reformatted to better fit the margin.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/2/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
PM 7/2/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
PM 7/2/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
PM 7/2/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
PM 7/2/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/2/2021:** The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement to the agency to address further comments/requests for clarifications.

**PM 9/15/2021:** The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement to the agency to address further comments/requests for clarifications. Please do reach out to me via email (pmarcoshuidobro@thegef.org) shall you need any clarifications on the latest comments/requests.

**PM 10/22/2021:**

**No. The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement to address comments raised by the GEF Policy team.**

**PM 11/3/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement

Response to  
Secretariat  
comments

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**