



# Accelerating low-carbon circular economy through cleantech innovation towards sustainable development in Pakistan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10885

**Countries**

Pakistan

**Project Name**

Accelerating low-carbon circular economy through cleantech innovation towards sustainable development in Pakistan

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

10/7/2022

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Remy Ruat

**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 Cleared**

January 12 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the revisions. The project alignment is less specific than PIF regarding specific technologies supported, but those are clarified at the beginning of the CEO ER in the investment mobilized and core indicator description sections, in line with the project objective and with the GEF-7 CCM focal area priorities, the objective being understood as unchanged, focusing on integrating renewable energy, energy efficiency, and waste management within the context of material, energy and resources sustainability and circularity. This will be monitored at MTR stage with the help among others of a technology sensitive and disaggregated GHG indicator calculation.

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the added summary of changes since PIF.

Pending on clarifications to be provided as an answer to section II.1 and II.4 of this review sheet.

October 31 2022 (RR):

Pending on clarifications to be provided as an answer to section II.4 of this review sheet.

As per usual practice and to foster traceability of project development, please also include at the beginning of the CEO ER a table summarizing the main changes since PIF stage.

#### Agency Response

**11 Jan. 2023 (UNIDO)**

Please find the responses to the section II.1 and II.4

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response to the comment at section II.4

Below explanation was included at the beginning.

#### **describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original pif**

- To clarify the project alignment to the GEF CCM focal are strategy, narratives at the description in the project document, in particular, the narratives on the scope of covered technologies, were revised.

- Slight changes to the co-financing amount have been made.

<b>Original project concept (PIF)</b>	<b>CEO approval version</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------

Total co-financing: USD 10,012,960	Total co-financing: USD 11,800,000	According to the stakeholder consultations and discussions with the MoCC, the total co-financing amount was increased while the distribution of the co-financing amount was adjusted.
In-kind: USD 7,962,960	In-kind: 5,300,000	
Investment mobilized: USD 2,050,000	Investment mobilized: USD 6,500,000	

- The mentioning of 'Project' under Component 3 was deleted to clarify the differentiation between the project component to PMC.

#### **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  
**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the clarifications

October 31 2022 (RR):

Subject to confirmation after clarifications on co-financing and budget.

Agency Response  
09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on co-financing and budget

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the submission of the UNIDO co-financing letter. The amounts in the letter match the amounts in the table (\$50,000 investment mobilized in grant and \$100,000 in-kind).

The updates of the NIC categorization and revised co-financing letter are well noted. It is understood that the in-kind contribution represents \$500,000 for judges, mentors and facilities, while investment to the amount of \$4,5 million is expected through all 3 components of the project as a grant through its projects and programmes that are aligned with project objectives, to benefit innovators that will be incubated and accelerated throughout the project.

The updated AHKMT categorization as investment mobilized, and related description as projects funds contributing to the project objectives, is also well noted. Thank you for the clarifications.

October 31 2022 (RR):

1. The description of how further investment mobilization is expected throughout the project based on past experience is clear, thank you for the level of details provided.

2. Please address the comment below on the NIC, AHKMT and UNIDO contributions.

UNIDO co-financing : no co-financing letter available for the 2 UNIDO co-financing contributions (grant and in-kind).

NIC : represents nearly half of the co-financing. The co-financing letter provided matches the amount described in the portal. However, the amount reported, of USD 5 million of in-kind, recurrent expenditures, is abnormally high for this type of co-financing and in comparison to other in-kind contributions provided in the table. As per GEF co-financing policy and guidelines, the GEF will accept in kind Co-Financing provided that in-kind resources are accounted for with the same diligence as other Co-Financing. Agencies ensure that any in-kind Co-Financing has been valued as the lesser of the cost or market value of the required

inputs they provide for the project. Therefore, a breakdown/calculation/justification of how the judges, facility and mentors allocated to the co-financing are able to amount to this level would be useful, as well as a revision accordingly as applicable.

AHKMT : the co-financing letter reports the amount as investment mobilized through investments in projects contributing to the projects objectives (and details the breakdown of sub-investments) but the agency chose to report it as in-kind recurrent expenditure, with the following justification : "While the co-financing letter from Dr. Akhter Hameed Khan Memorial Trust mentions USD 1,700,000 as investment mobilized, it is deemed ?recurrent expenditure? as it states the parallel projects aligned with the project activities." This justification is at this stage not in line with the Co-financing policy and guidelines : Investment mobilized means the sub-set of co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures; the fact that the projects are in parallel and aligned with the project activities is not sufficient to consider it as recurrent expenditures. Please either revise the table to categorize the AHKMT contribution as investment mobilized consistently with the co-financing letter, or adjust the co-financing letter and its description with justification in line with the co-financing policy and guidelines.

3. the co-financing below is cleared of comments, thank you for the provided details.

Innovators Garage (cleared) : co-financing letter provided for the in-kind (recurrent expenditures directly linked to project outputs) and grant co-financing (investment mobilized); the amount match (USD 200 000 and 400 000 respectively) with a clear description of the breakdown, related to incubation for the in-kind contribution and investor portal for the grant funding.

NPO (cleared) : co-financing letter provided for the in-kind USD 350 000 co-financing which matches the amount reported on the portal. The detailed contribution that this will support is not outlined in the letter - this description is however available in the stakeholder table in section II.2 (stakeholders).

NRSP (cleared) : co-financing letter provided matches the amount of USD 4 million (grant, investment mobilized) described in the portal with a clear description of how the financing was identified, through a renewable energy micro-credit facility, and related to project components.

Agency Response  
09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the below explanation:

UNIDO ? The co-financing letter is attached.

NIC ? The revised co-financing letter is attached and narrative was adjusted to regard it as both ?investment mobilized? and ?in-kind, recurrent expenditure? and description was added under the list of co-financing table.

AHKMT ? The co-financing category was revised to ?investment mobilized? and description was added under the list of co-financing table.

**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 **Cleared**

Agency Response N.A.

**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  
**Cleared**

October 31 2022(RR):

Yes, although comments to be addressed regarding the status in the relevant section of the review sheet (annexes).

Agency Response N.A.

**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  
**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the provided confirmation and clarification. This is well noted and will be monitored at MTR stage.

October 31 2022 (RR):

No adjustment made to the core indicator targets.

Thank you for having submitted a table in an excel format as an annex to the submission as per usual practice. The annex and table E description provide more transparency and clarity on how the number from PIF stage was derived.

However, as identified at PIF stage, an updated estimate following the assessment made during PPG phase was expected considering the revised project scope, and drawing on the GCIP approach to be developed as outlined in annex I of the PFD and in the activities of the related global child project. This is not provided at this stage.

It is our understanding based on the data presented in the CEO ER that methodologies will continue being benchmarked during implementation phase and that a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed as part of project GEFID 10461 (GCIP). Please confirm whether this understanding is correct or provide clarifications and additional information and status update in case it is not.

Please also refer to comment on item II.4 of this review sheet regarding the scope of covered technologies, which would benefit from clarification in the description of table E.

#### Agency Response

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

It is also UNIDO's understanding that the project will be aligned with the GEFID 10461 (GCIP) and a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed under the GCIP.

The scope of technologies is revised as per the GCIP programme and it now reads as following:

*"The project will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy*



*efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."*

## **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

**Cleared**

January 12 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the revisions. The section is now consistent with the objectives of the project.

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the added clarification regarding the alignment with the GCIP programme.

However, all sections of the CEO AR document have not been revised accordingly and the document is at this stage still corresponding to a waste management focused project .The entire document should be re-balanced in order to reflect the renewable energy and energy efficiency priorities of this project. (please see comment in section II.4 of this review sheet for more details).

Specific to the root causes and barriers section, the description does not fit the categories of renewable energy ("maximizing energy source" is not equivalent to renewable energy cleantech innovation) and energy efficiency (same issue for "recovery of energy" and "considering life cycle of materials") and are all formulated with a meaning consistent with waste management and waste to energy rather than the two former categories : *"Nurturing business models, services and products with established local ecosystem for cleantech innovation can be one of the counter measures to address these issues including e.g. maximizing energy source from renewables, enhancing energy efficiency at the process including recovery of energy as well as minimizing environmental impact considering life cycle of materials."* This is further verified by the end of the paragraph which only refers to the waste management ecosystem : *"in addition, the capacity of market players like developers, technology suppliers and financiers needs to be further strengthened especially in terms of dealing with the business in the field of sustainable and integrated waste management as well as the associated technologies."*

The root causes and barriers to be addressed would benefit from a clarification. This project focuses on early stage cleantech innovation, not on large scale infrastructure planning and management. The first paragraph is therefore unclear on this regard : *"planning infrastructural management and coming up with new and innovative solutions towards taking*

*sustainable pathway*". Please revise in accordance with the overall objective and content of the project.

The barriers and challenges to implementation table , under its knowledge, awareness and capacity related barriers section, as well as behaviour related barriers section and policy and regulatory related barriers, refers only to the waste management sector in the detailed bullet points of the second column.

Thank you for revising this section accordingly.

October 31 2022 (RR):

As reflected in paragraph 15 of this section, the main root barriers identified relate solely to the waste management sector, which is not eligible to GEF-7 CCM financing. Please re-equilibrate this section with the renewable energy and energy efficiency priorities eligible to GEF-7 financing. Please see also comment on section II.4. of this review for more details on this point.

#### Agency Response

**11 Jan. 2023 (UNIDO)**

- The entire document was revised to clarify the project focus on accelerating cleantech innovation and alignment with the GEF priorities.
- Specifically to the root causes and barriers section, the description such as "maximizing energy source", "recovery of energy", "considering lifecycle of materials? and ?sustainable and integrated waste management as well as the associated technologies" were taken out. In addition, the narrative on large scale infrastructure planning and management were deleted to clarify the project focus on accelerating cleantech innovation and alignment with the GEF priorities.
- The narrative at the table describing the barriers and challenges were also revised to clarify the project focus on accelerating cleantech innovation and alignment with the GEF priorities.

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

The scope of technologies is revised as per the GCIP programme and it now reads as following:

*"The project will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."*

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared**

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

January 12 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the revisions. The alternative scenario lacks clarity in the specific technologies supported, but those are clarified at the beginning of the CEO ER in the investment mobilized and core indicator description sections, in line with the project objective, which is understood as unchanged, focusing on integrating renewable energy, energy efficiency, and waste management within the context of material, energy and resources sustainability and circularity. This will be monitored at MTR stage with the help among others of a technology disaggregated GHG indicator calculation.

January 5 2023 (RR):

Pending on clarification on allocation of efforts and financing to full scope of GEF-7 aligned technologies targetted in the project objective (items II.1 and II.4 of this review sheet).

Also, paragraph 106. refers to the project as a GCIP country project - please revise to clarify that this project is not a child project of the GCIP programme. *(106. The activities under Component 3 are aimed at ensuring that the achievements of the Pakistan accelerator programme are alignment and coherent with other GCIP country projects under the global GCIP framework.)*

October 31 2022 (RR):

Pending on clarification on allocation of efforts and financing to eligible technologies and on co-financing.

## Agency Response

**11 Jan. 2023 (UNIDO)**

- Please find the responses to the comment received at the section II.1 and II.4.
- The narrative at the para 106 (the new para 101) was revised and now reads as following:

*The activities under Component 3 are aimed at ensuring that the achievements of the Pakistan accelerator programme are alignment and coherent with the global GCIP framework. To this purpose, the project executing entity of Pakistan accelerator programme is expected to collaborate with the GCIP Global through the global GCIP project executing entities (PFAN, NGIN, CTG, UNIDO), as well as to contribute to information gathering, knowledge sharing, and dissemination efforts.*

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on the scope of technologies and co-financing.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared**

January 12 2023 (RR):

For record, the objective approved at PIF stage is the following : "Promote high-impact clean technology innovation for scale up climate action and creation of green jobs in Pakistan, integrating renewable energy, energy efficiencies, and waste management within the context of material, energy and resources sustainability and circularity."

While the new wording for the main objective and related revisions re-establishes a balance between the three components of the project objective, by not mentioning any of them, it also leads to a loss of clarity on what exactly will be supported as part of the alternative scenario. These technologies are only specified as part of the monitoring component and on the eligibility criteria.

The revisions are cleared with the understanding that the project objective remains unchanged, integrating renewable energy, energy efficiency and waste management within the context of material, energy and resources sustainability and circularity, as hinted at among other references for the first time in the CEO AR in the investment mobilized description section, in line with the GCIP programme scope. The consistency of technologies accelerated with this scope will be monitored at MTR stage, including through a technology sensitive GHG emission reduction indicator calculation.

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the added clarification regarding the alignment with the GCIP programme.

However, all sections of the CEO AR document has not been revised accordingly and is at this stage still corresponding to a waste management focused project, as reflected in

- the main objective outlined in the project results framework annex ("*Promote high-impact clean technology innovation for scale up climate action and creation of green jobs, especially in integrated waste value chain in Pakistan*"), which does not match the overall project objective outlined at the beginning of the CEO AR

- the coordination section, which mentions a contribution to waste to energy systems under this project (the GEF-7 CCM strategy does not cover grid connected waste-to-energy facilities).

- output 1.2.1 (para 70) only refers solely to waste management and waste to energy ("*Therefore innovations supported under this output will further integrate sustainable waste management systems and small-scale waste to energy models of Pakistan.*")

- the root causes and barriers section (as outlined in item II.1 of this review sheet).

The entire document is expected to be re-balanced, beyond narrative additions, in order to structurally reflect in project components and alternative scenario the renewable energy and energy efficiency priorities of this project (to be noted, the term energy "efficiencies" is used in multiple occurrences throughout the document - thank you for revising for consistency and clarity purposes).

October 31 2022 (RR):

Please provide clarification on the scope of the project. The current proposal includes a main focus on waste, which is not covered in the CCM focal area strategy and can not be covered by GEF financing. Any such technology supported by the project would have to be covered by co-financing. Please re-equilibrate all sections of the CEO-ER to reflect the renewable energy and energy efficiency components, as reflected with the example of the section on root causes and barriers to be addressed, outlined above.

As as a reference, the GCIP programme mentioned the following covered technologies :  
"For climate change focal area, the program will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."

## Agency Response

**11 Jan. 2023 (UNIDO)**

- The entire document was revised to clarify the project focus on accelerating cleantech innovation and alignment with the GEF priorities.
- The main objective in the project results framework annex as well as at the Section B of the Part I was adjusted to reflect the project scope and alignment to the GEF priority which now reads as following:

*Promote high-impact clean technology innovation for scale up climate action and creation of green jobs in Pakistan*

- At the section of '6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination?', the narrative was revised to delete the contribution to waste to energy systems.
- The description under Output 1.2.1 was revised to clarify the project scope and alignment to GEF priorities.
- the root causes and barriers section was revised as per the comment received at the section II.1
- The term 'energy efficiencies?' was revised to 'energy efficiency?'

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

The narrative of the project revised thoroughly in the project document. The scope of technologies is revised as per the GCIP programme and it now reads as following:

*"The project will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."*

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the clarifications

October 31 2022 (RR) :

Pending on clarifications on co-financing outlined above.

Agency Response  
09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on co-financing.

**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  
**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the revisions and clarifications. Remaining clarifications on project scope and related effective contribution to GEB will be addressed in other sections of this review sheet, in particular II.1 and II.4.

October 31 2022 (RR):

Please see and address the comment in section I.7 of this review sheet on GHG calculations.

Please also address in this section the comment in section II.4 of this review regarding waste-to-energy.

Agency Response  
09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response at the section I.7 & II.4.

The scope of technologies is revised as per the GCIP programme and it now reads as following:

*"The project will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."*

**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  
**Cleared**

October 31 2022 (RR):

The potential for scaling up is outlined in more details including through past experiences from similar programs. The innovation and sustainable sections are outlined in a similar manner as in the PIF.

Agency Response N.A.  
**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  
**Cleared**

October 31 2022 (RR):

Provided in section II.1.b.



Agency Response N.A.

**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

N/A.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

October 31 2022 (RR):

Yes - Evidence has been provided in Annex N of a 3 phases engagement including a stakeholder workshop held in September 2022 in Islamabad. Stakeholders to be further engaged, dissemination and engagement also outlined including through PPG work.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared :**

October 31 2022 (RR):

Yes - Gender analysis attached in Annex K. It identifies gender gaps and opportunities linked to project objectives and activities and includes gender-responsible activities, reflected among others in table B.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

October 31 2022 (RR):

Yes - Private sector has been among the stakeholders engaged in project preparation (Annex N) and is among the categories of co-financiers identified, including in particular the Innovators Garage.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared.**

October 31 2022 (RR)

Thank you for the additional details provided regarding alternatives proposed for risk mitigation related to the covid19 context, as identified at PIF stage.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared.**

October 31 2022 (RR):

Yes, linked to the GCIP program. The budget for these activities is outlined in paragraph 198 as an introduction to the timeline/deliverables table.

Agency Response N.A.

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared.**

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

October 31 2022 (RR):

At PIF stage, it was identified that further details would be explored during PPG phase regarding linkages with the GCIP program on monitoring and evaluation. This has been done with a scope and indicative budget provided. The detailed M&E Plan remains to be further developed during project kick-start.

Agency Response N.A.

**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

**Cleared**

October 31 2022(RR):

Yes, this is clearly identified in paragraphs 205 to 208.

Agency Response N.A.

**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the clarifications and related revisions of annexes.

October 31 2022 (RR):

Pending clarifications regarding budget table

Agency Response

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on the budget table below.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared**

January 12 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the adjustment of the table which now fits within the margins.

January 5 2023 (RR):

The provided table in Annex A is currently too large and extends beyond the margins - please reformat in order to allow the final document to capture the entire table.

October 31 2022 (RR):

Included in annex A.

Agency Response

**11 Jan. 2023 (UNIDO)**

The Annex A was revised and resized.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared**

January 12 2023 (RR):

While the new wording for the main objective and related revisions re-establishes a balance between the three components of the project objective, by not mentioning any of them, it also leads to a loss of clarity on what exactly will be supported as part of the alternative scenario. The project alignment is thus less clear throughout the CEO AR than the PIF regarding specific technologies supported, but those are clarified at the beginning of the CEO ER in the investment mobilized and core indicator description sections, in line with the project objective and with the GEF-7 CCM focal area priorities, the objective being understood as unchanged, focusing on integrating renewable energy, energy efficiency, and waste management within the context of material, energy and resources sustainability and circularity. This will be monitored at MTR stage with the help among others of a technology sensitive and disaggregated GHG indicator calculation showing a maximized GHG emission reductions impact.

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the revision of annex E and for the clarifications on project scope and GHG emissions, well noted.

Please address the pending comments already flagged at PIF stage regarding project scope.

October 31 2022 (RR)

Please address the following issue : on the budget table in Annex E, from a policy perspective, we note that the finance expert is charged to component 1 while National Project Coordinator and Project Assistant are charged across all components and PMC. They should be in general charged to PMC only.

Please also address the pending comments already flagged at PIF stage regarding project scope and GHG emissions.

## Agency Response

**11 Jan. 2023 (UNIDO)**

The scope of the technologies of the project is, as mentioned under the table at the section of core indicator as well as at the section of 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies, electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems. The project document was also revised to clarify the alignment to the GEF 7 priorities as per the comments received in particular at II.1 and II.4.

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Annex E was revised to make NPC and PA only charged under PMC. The job description in Annex M was also revised accordingly. In addition, the mentioning of 'Project?' under Component 3 was deleted to clarify the differentiation between the project component to PMC. Accordingly, the project document, Annex A, Annex I and Annex L were revised.

-As mentioned at the response at the section I.7, the scope of technologies is revised as per the GCIP programme and it now reads as following:

*"The project will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."*

The project will be aligned with the GEFID 10461 (GCIP) and a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed under the GCIP.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **N/A.**

Agency Response **N.A.**

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **N/A.**

Agency Response **N.A.**

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **N/A.**

Agency Response **N.A.**

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **N/A.**

Agency Response N.A.

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A.

Agency Response N.A.

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

January 5 2023 (RR):

Thank you for the revisions of annex C and for the clarifications.

October 31 2022 (RR):

Please address the following issue: from a policy perspective, the item "CEO endorsement request submitted to GEF Sec, with full document package including" is not an eligible activity but an output. Please list the eligible activities/expenditures (i.e. meetings, consultants, etc.) per the content included in Guidelines.

Please also refer to comment in section I.7 above regarding further expectations on GHG calculation as initially identified at PIF stage. 23,645.74 USD out of the 50,000 USD is declared to have been used so far and the remainder is earmarked to support project kick-start. Further clarification would be welcome on how the PPG can be used to answer the main pending questions identified at PIF stage. It is noted in particular that the GHG assessments remain identical as the initial estimate at this stage (the PIF explicitly identified that further assessment was expected during PPG phase) and that the announced use of the remaining funds is only focused on project implementation activities that were not initially identified as part of the PPG scope.

Agency Response

09 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Annex C was revised.



As mentioned at the response at the section I.7, the scope of technologies is revised as per the GCIP programme and it now reads as following:

"The project will prioritize cleantech innovations in the domains that are fully aligned with GEF 7 priorities i.e. electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency, decentralized renewable energy power with energy storage, and cleantech innovations related sustainable cities and sustainable food systems."

The project will be aligned with the GEFID 10461 (GCIP) and a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed under the GCIP. Moving ahead, the remaining PPG will be used for capacity building among the project stakeholders which include the subject of GHG emissions assessment to cover the associated costs of e.g. workshops, trainings and outreach/knowledge materials.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **Cleared**

Agency Response N.A.

**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

N/A.

Agency Response

N.A.

**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 N/A.

Agency Response N.A.

**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 N/A.

Agency Response N.A.

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 12 2023 (RR):

Remaining comments have been addressed, although the lack of clarity will call for a well detailed MTR to allow monitoring to identify the effective impact on GHG reductions in line with the scope of GEF-7 CCM focal area priorities.

The CEO endorsement is technically cleared

January 5 2023 (RR):

Not yet. Comments have been addressed regarding GHG emissions, budget table, co-financing. However, a more structural revision of the project document is missing in order to confirm alignment with the project objective and CCM priorities. Thank you for resubmitting as soon as possible for further review.

October 31 2022 (RR):

Not yet - comments to be addressed by the agency, including in particular on alignment with CCM priorities, GHG emissions, co-financing, and budget table.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>11/1/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/5/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/12/2023</b>	

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat comments**

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

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project is recommended for endorsement. Points highlighted at PIF stage for a monitoring during implementation have all been addressed by the agency with clarifications provided to the project structure.

1. Regarding co-financing, justification has been provided on how additional co-financing is expected through private sector mobilization, based on the experience of passed similar projects. The co-financing structure has been confirmed including in terms of how the investment mobilized will support scaling up accelerated clean technologies in line with the scope of the project, in particular on energy efficiency, renewable energy and other relevant clean technologies with a view to maximize climate change mitigation impact, with several co-financiers supporting respectively these three components of the overall project objective for the scale-up phase.
2. As the cleantech-specific GHG emission calculation methodologies are currently being explored as part of the separate GCIP global coordination project, with which this project will share significant synergies, it was not possible to apply them yet and estimates from PIF stage were used, with increased resolution and clarity on the scope of technologies supported, also in alignment with the GCIP. The detailed assessment and related criteria will be applied during implementation and monitored at MTR stage in a way that will enable to identify the contribution of various supported high-impact technologies to GHG emission reductions. This will contribute to a comprehensive monitoring of the project for which less details are available throughout the CEO Approval request regarding the scope of technologies supported.