

Reduction of POPs and UPOPs through integrated sound management of chemicals

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10686

Countries

Philippines

Project Name

Reduction of POPs and UPOPs through integrated sound management of chemicals

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

2/4/2022

Review completed by PM

5/12/2022

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

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

4.25.2022:

Cleared

4.5.2022:

Please indicate and highlight the addition mentioned in the review sheet ("For the secondary entry, ...") as it is unclear in the CEOER itself.

2.9.2022

Please correct ?Objectives/Programs? of the second entry in the Table A. Presumably this should be EA. If this is due to the GEF portal?s constraints, please mention so in the document.

Agency Response

4.22. 2022

The following explanation is provided under B. Project description summary in the GEF Portal.

?In the table A, the second entry should be CW-EA for the 'Objectives/Programmes'. Due to the fact that the GEF portal does not have such an option, CW 1-1 had been selected instead.?

2.25. 2022

Please note the GEF Portal did not have an option for EA, that?s why we were unable to choose it. The below comment is now added to the GEF Portal. ?For the second entry, the correct ?Objectives/ Programs? should be CM-EA.?

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022

Please explain changes made from the PIF stage. For example, rational for adding Outputs 2.1.2.

Agency Response

2.25, 2022

The added Output 2.1.2 concerns with the further refinement or confirmation of the eligibility criteria (set out in Output 2.1.2) and sectors (see output 2.2.1), as well as shortlisting application enterprises. The criteria and selected sectors identified during PPG stage will be refined or confirmed under Output 2.1.2 in case baseline situation changes from PPG to inception.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

5.6.2022:

Cleared.

5.5.2022:

Land Bank of the Philippines and Development Bank of the Philippines: these 2 entities appear to be government-owned institutions. If so, change 'Other?' to 'Recipient country government?'.

2.9.2022

- An exchange rate is not mentioned for the co-finance from the Land Bank of the Philippines.
- Please elaborate further on how 'the amount was discounted for the duration of the project?' for the co-financing from the Development Bank of the Philippines. How was this calculated?
- There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC.

Recommended action: Please consider the above point(s).

Agency Response

5.5.2022:

Yes. We confirm that they are state-owned banks. Thanks for the comments. We have revised it to 'Recipient country government?' in the CEO ER and in the Portal.

2.25. 2022

- 1) The exchange rate used for the co-financing from the Land Bank of the Philippines is USD1=PHP50.70 (November 2021 UNORE forex). The PHP 19 million in the cofinancing letter equals to USD 374,754 in the cofinancing table. This is now added under the co-financing table.
- 2) The total amount of GFP funding is USD 600 million up to 2030, out of which USD 270 million remains uncommitted for the remaining years. This amount is then discounted to 150 million for five years of project duration. Out of the six funding windows, two (resource use efficiency, waste management and pollution control) are most relevant to the project objective and thus partially accounted for and can be accessed by project beneficiaries. These detailed explanations have now been added to the CEO ER.
- 3) Upon consultations with the stakeholders, the co-financing has been rearranged to secure a substantial amount of co-financing also for the PMC component. The overall co-financing secured by the project exceeds the ratio 7:1. The project financing table is also updated to show proportionality.

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 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

5.12.2022:

Cleared.

5.11.2022:

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000.00			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent to Date	Amount Committed
1. International & National Consultants fee	107,000.00	61,884.50	45,115.50
	38,000.00	29,912.00	8,088.00
2. Salaries - Local PPG Coordinator	2,100.00	2,100.00	166.42
	900.00	733.58	2,000.00
3. HACT Micro Assessment	2,000.00		
4. Communications			
5. Inception and Validation Workshop			
Total	150,000.00	94,530.08	55,469.92

Status of utilization of PPG: the figures (\$\$\$) are not aligned with the budget lines, so it is not possible to understand how much was spent / committed. Besides, please confirm whether the Local PPG coordinator was either UNDP or Governmental staff.

5.5.2022:

Status of PPG utilization: as requested in the template, please provide details on expenditure categories for this PPG report ? please provide the information by categories of expenditure (consultants, workshops, travel costs, salaries if any) as opposed to by output (i.e. preparation of UNDP-GEF project document).

Agency Response

5.12, 2022

We had checked our entries in the Portal and noted that the misalignment was due to the Portal aggregating/squeezing blank entries during copy-paste. We have added ?zeros? to

the two blank entries in the Portal, uploaded it as a ?picture?, not as ?text?, and uploaded a revised CEO ER. Budget lines and numbers are fully aligned now.

We clarify that local PPG coordinator is not UNDP staff nor GOV staff, but an Independent Consultant recruited with PPG Funds to support IP staff during the PPG phase.

5.5.2022:

This annex has been revised in the CEO ER and the Portal. Expenditure data by categories are presented in the revised Annex C.

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

4.25.2022:

Cleared

4.5.2022:

Thank you for clarification. Please reflect them in the CEOER or highlight the change as it is difficult to identify the change made.

2.9.2022

- Please elaborate on the decrease in Indicator 11 from the PIF stage.
- PIF mentioned: ?Further reduction of other industrial POPs cannot be calculated at this stage, as it would be based on the PPG preliminary inventory?. Please elaborate and include other industrial POPs based on the PPG inventory, if any.

Agency Response

4.22.2022:

For the ease of review, we have now uploaded a CEO ER document as an attachment to the GEF Portal; the changes are highlighted in red.

2.25. 2022

1) During PIF stage, direct beneficiaries were defined in three types: people who benefit directly from chemicals reduction; people who are the target of awareness raising and training activities; and people who participate in capacity building. During PPG stage, it was concluded that the number of people benefiting from awareness raising activities should be considered as indirect beneficiaries. This caused a slight reduction in direct beneficiary numbers compared to PIF stage. Meanwhile, more people will be involved in training activities and job creation and they are counted as direct beneficiaries, thus an increase in direct beneficiaries. Overall, removing awareness raising beneficiaries caused the decrease in direct beneficiary numbers.

2) Due to the ongoing Covid pandemic, the PPG team met mostly virtually with several manufacturers, and collected indirect evidence that POPs like SCCP, HBCDD, PFOS, PFOAs, deca-BDE are still imported and used in the country. The team was unable to visit enterprises and manufacturing sites therefore impossible to quantify POPs usage and amount. The update of the NIP, which includes POP inventory, will therefore be carried out entirely at project implementation stage under project component 1. The PPG team has gathered strong evidence that POPs are still being imported and used because:

a) a ban of the new industrial POPs listed under annex A or B of the convention after 2013 is not in place, therefore such chemicals may be available in the market;

b) Customs capacity to identify industrial POPs in mixtures or articles is minimal (see the section related to the baseline scenario, subsection "Rules on Import and Export including HS codes" of the CEO ER for details); and,

c) Manufacturing sectors using POPs (based on the experience gathered in other countries) are widely represented in the Philippines, like manufacturers of rubber-chlorinated and anti-rust paints (use of SCCP); importers or manufactures of EPS and XPS (use of HBCDD); hard-chrome plating enterprises (use of PFOS); manufacturers of PVC (use of SCCP).

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

4.26.2022:

Cleared.

4.25.2022:

Please also include Outcomes/GEBS in the ToC, as similar to what has been included in PIF.

4.5.2022:

Please also include Outputs in the ToC.

2.9.2022

ToC (Figure 1) is very difficult to read. Please provide the ToC with a higher resolution.

Agency Response

4.26.2022

As suggested, the last column of the ToC is revised to include Outcomes/GEBs. A revised ToC is attached to the Portal too. Same change is reflected in the uploaded revised CEO ER.

4.22.2022:

Included as advised and a revised ToC has been uploaded to the Portal, both via copy-paste and a separate attachment.

2.25. 2022

Figure 1 on ToC is provided as a separate attachment in the portal library, document titled "ToC".

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

4.29.2022:

Cleared

4.26.2022:

4) Cleared

6.2) Thank you for the explanation. It seems there is response on 6.1) (on POPs) reflected under Core Indicator table, but not 6.2) on selection of industrial zones.

4.25.2022:

Cleared: 6.1)

4) Please reflect the change (i.e., 'criteria finalization') also in Table B.

6.2) Please reflect the explanation provided in the review sheet in the CEOER itself.

4.5.2022:

Cleared: 1), 2), 3), 5), 6.1), 7)

4): Thank you for the elaboration. If criteria are already available as described in Output 2.1.1, what will be done under Output 2.1.2 in terms of 'criteria development'?

6.1): Please reflect the chemicals this project deals in the Indicator 9.1.; i.e., PFOS/PFOAs, PBDEs, PBBs, SCCP and HBCDD. Currently there are only two chemicals listed under Indicator 9.1, while CEOER mentions '4 manufacturing facilities from the key manufacturing sectors implementing Green Chemistry approach under FREEME, with direct reduction of at least 20 tons of SCCP, PBDEs, PBBs, PFOS/PFOAs, and HBCDD.'

6.2): Please reflect the explanation provided in the review sheet in the CEOER itself, or highlight the change as it is difficult to identify the change.

2.9.2022

- Please elaborate on changes made from the PIF stage; in particular, addition of Outputs 2.1.2.

- PIF mentioned: ??survey will be conducted on at least 30 factories, to be identified during PPG phase?. Please elaborate on this identification and survey, and how the CEOER is building on the activities and findings from the PPG phase.

- Please elaborate on FREEME privilege loan, particularly on \$ reflow/repay; for example, what is the overall reflow/repay mechanism, what will it be used for (revolving fund?) etc. It is mentioned that sustainability of FREEME is not automatic.

- Output 2.1.2: While there is an explanation on actives to be taken, please elaborate further on the criteria itself. What are the criteria and/or, how will they be developed/refined, to ensure that the right applicants are selected.

Also, please clarify followings: (i) ?enterprises which will be demonstrated under the project?; (ii) ?60 enterprises to design intervention?; and, (iii) ?4 out of at least 60 applicants ? direct support under the project?. Are (i) and (ii) the same, and (iii) is those selected from (i)/(iii)?

- Output 2.2.1.:

(1) CEOER states ?At least 4 (four) manufacturing facilities from the key manufacturing sectors implementing Green Chemistry approach under FREEME, with direct reduction of at least 10 tons of SCCP, PBDEs and PCBs and 10 tons of PFOS/PFOAs?; however, only PFOS and SCCP are mentioned under Indicator. Also, how will the POPs reduction from the other 56+ manufacturing facilities under the FREEME ensured, monitored and reported?

(2) Please elaborate further on how three industrial zones and four manufacturing facilities were identified. In addition, please provide explanation on how they are appropriate for the purpose of this project. Although this is a national project, three industrial zones seem to be geographically concentrated; how is this justified?

- Green chemistry and green design: Please provide examples of green chemistry and green design that will be /can be taken up in the project. If these are to be identified during the implementation, please elaborate on its process etc. in order to make it clear

that the appropriate green design /green chemistry approaches will be identified. Also, please clarify the difference between green design and green chemistry, within the context of this project. Green design can be a part of green chemistry.

Recommended action: Please consider the above point(s).

Agency Response

4.29, 2022.

The explanation regarding selection of industrial zones has been added under Outcome 2.2 in the CEO ER.

4.26.2022

4) Revised Table B again in the Portal. The previous round made the revision, but this one was lost in the GEF Portal.

6.2) The explanation was already provided in the GEF Portal and in the uploaded CEO ER document.

In the Portal, it's below the Core Indicators table.

In the uploaded CEO ER document, it's shown under 'Annex F' core indicator worksheet.

4.22.2022:

Thanks.

4) The activities intended are refining and finalizing of selection criteria for enterprises after site visits. We appreciate the comment and have revised it to 'criteria finalization?.'

6.1) We confirm that the CEO ER statement is accurate: a total of at least 20 tons of SCCP, PBDEs, PBBs, PFOS/PFOAs, and HBCDD will be phased out from 4 pilot facilities, among which 10 tons of PFOS/PFOAs, and 10 tons of SCCP, PBDEs, PBBs, and HBCDD. Plus the expected regulatory phaseout of 172.5 tons of PFOS/PFOAs, total PFOS/PFOAs phaseout is 182.5 tons, as shown under Indicator 9.1.

For the 10 tons of SCCP, PBDEs, PBBs, and HBCDD, SCCP is selected under Indicator 9.1 given that 1) the Portal does not provide higher class for PBDE and PBB to select from; 2) the breakdown among substances will be available during implementation after site visit verifications with selected pilot enterprises. It will be provided in PIRs and MTR.

A note has been added under the Core Indicator tables to explain. The updated CEO ER attachment also highlighted the note in red for ease of reference.

2.25. 2022

1) Addressed under Question 2 of Part I. Same response is copied below:

The added Output 2.1.2 concerns with the further refinement or confirmation of the eligibility criteria (set out in Output 2.1.2) and sectors (see output 2.2.1), as well as shortlisting application enterprises. The criteria and selected sectors identified during PPG stage will be refined or confirmed under Output 2.1.2 in case baseline situation changes from PPG to inception.

2) As field surveys to enterprise sites were not possible during the PPG stage due to COVID-19 restrictions, the selection of enterprises to be engaged at implementation has been achieved through the identification of industrial zones where to conduct project activities. During PPG, discussions were held with associations of enterprises through online meetings, their inputs and interests in participating actively in project activities were also confirmed. At implementation, field surveys and visits will be carried out within the 3 industrial zone identified, details are described under Output 2.2.1 of the CEO ER.

3) Under Outcome 2.1, FREEME mechanism is introduced as based on GEF investment, as well as on long term loans co-financed by local bank (mainly from the Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP), some from Land Bank of the Philippines LBP). Enterprises applying and receiving FREEME loans will repay the loan at interest rate and conditions established by the lending banks. Reflow will be materialized through a combination of payment of principals, and interests from enterprise borrowers, and continued national banks? allocation to green chemistry related funding windows.

4) The criteria are for the selection of the enterprises, which are reported in detail as part of the description of Output 2.1.1. These criteria were drafted based on UNDP?s experience in other countries (e.g. China, Vietnam) and revised upon consultations with private sector stakeholders. During implementation, the team will conduct sites visits and confirm with industry associations, interested enterprises, and banks to refine these criteria.

5) Enterprises referred under (i) are the 4 enterprises who will receive project funding via FREEME and technical assistance to demonstrate green chemistry with POP avoidance within project duration; the (ii) 60 enterprises are the expected number of enterprises which receive technical assistance from the project to design green chemistry interventions to be submitted to FREEME for financing; (iii) ?4 out of at least 60 applicants is the same enterprises with (i.).

6.1) The expected reduction of POPs use and release will be achieved at two levels: direct reduction in the 4 pilot enterprises; and prohibition of POPs import and consumption. Additionally, the provision of technical assistance for the additional 56 enterprises (in addition to the 4 pilots) are expected to encourage additional numbers of enterprises to apply for FREEME financing and thus yield additional GEBs during the project cycle and right after the project completion as ?scaling up? result.

Philippines will also use the experiences gathered by UNDP in other projects (Vietnam Green Chemistry), where despite the limited information provided by the industrial sectors at project design ad inception, the amount of direct avoidance achieved exceeded the GEB target by far upon the implementation of such actions. Given that the Philippine has a similar structure of the manufacturing sector, it is very likely to achieve the proposed target. All direction avoidance from FREEME participating enterprises will be monitored and reported under the project?s results framework.

The project deals with PFOS/PFOAs, PBDEs, PBBs, SCCP and HBCDD. Any typo or inconsistencies have been addressed in the updated CEO ER.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4.25.2022:

Cleared

2.9.2022

Please see comment to Part I-1.

Agency Response

2.25. 2022

Addressed above

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022

Under Indicator 9.1., 182.5 metric tons of PFOS is indicated to be removed or disposed, while this is 172.5 tons under section ?6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF)?.

Agency Response

2.25. 2022

We confirm that a total of 192.5 tons of POPs will be removed or disposed of by the project. This includes 172.5 tons from POPs import and consumption control, plus at least 20 tons of direct avoidance industrial POPs from the demonstration in the 4 pilot enterprises (with a breakdown of 10 tons of PFOs/PFOA & 10 tons of SCCP, PBB, and PBDE). This results in 182.5 tons of PFOs/PFOA and 10 tons of SCCP/PBB/PBDE as shown under Indicator 9.1, and under section 6.

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022

- Please refer to comment on green chemistry in Part II-3.
- The CEOER states that 'innovation here consists mainly in using eligibility criteria as the basis for accessing the competitive loan'. Please elaborate and clarify use of which criteria are considered innovative. Some criteria seem to be developed during the implementation (Output 2.1.2).

Agency Response

2.25. 2022

The eligibility criteria envisages that at least 3 out of 12 green chemistry principles, in addition to the replacement of POPs, will be implemented in the enterprises applying to the FREEME funding. Piloting green chemistry principles has huge potentials for triggering (technological) innovation as a result of shift from 'substance replacement' to a wider approach which involves the design of products and processes to reduce the environmental footprint of the manufacturing of chemicals and of chemically intensive products. Even though there is an increase in the uptake of sustainability initiatives for manufacturing processes (e.g. the Road Map toward sustainability and inclusiveness promoted by the Board of Investment), the application of Green Chemistry approach is completely new.

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

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

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022

Figure in para 21 is broken.

Agency Response

2.25. 2022

This has been fixed in the revised CEO ER.

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022

In Table 3, it is stated as follows: ?1.3. Provision equal access to green jobs generated by the Project with the adoption of Green Chemistry and circular economy?. Please elaborate further on circular economy to be adopted, as this is not clear in the main text.

Agency Response

2.25. 2022

?Circular economy? is now deleted to avoid confusion. It was initially there as ?green chemistry? principles are also considered as, in an indirect way, contributing to ?circular economy? of some sector as a better design (green design using green chemistry principle) are one of the starting points that allow final industrial products to become fully recyclable, and circular. However, we highlight that the focus of the Project is not to fully operate under Circular Economy.

Finally, as a matter of additional contribution, Project trainings will also incorporate contents on the contribution of ?green chemistry? activities towards ?circular economy? as explained above.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

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

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022:

Please further elaborate on the timeline?

Agency Response

2.25. 2022

In term of Timeline, as illustrated in Annex 4 to the project document (Multi-year work plan), Output 4.1.4. (An integrated knowledge management system developed on POPs and their alternatives) is envisaged to be carried out continuously along project implementation. In term of targets, under the project monitoring plan (annex 5 to the project document) the following has been established:

First year: Procedures for the acquisition and exchange of information and knowledge generated by the project established.

Second year At least one knowledge sharing workshop involving UN/GEF projects on ecolabeling, green chemistry and green financing held where lesson learnt for each project component are shared.

Third year: At least one further knowledge sharing workshop (for a project total of 2) involving UN/GEF projects on ecolabeling, green chemistry and green financing held where lesson learnt for each project component are shared and proposal for follow up activities discussed.

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

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

Yes.

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

4.5.2022:

Cleared.

2.9.2022

On Risk 1, mitigation measures are explained for four enterprises from the priority sectors under Component 2, but it seems this is not clear for the remaining 56+ facilities that will be supported under FREEME, but will not receive direct technical support.

Agency Response

The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) covers the four enterprises selected under component 2, thus can be extended to the universe of targeted companies that will replicate/scale up (or benefit from) the project results.

The Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will focus on assessing the risks and mitigating potential adverse impacts of the project at company level. By UNDP Policy, these are limited to the impacts directly caused by the Project (meaning the pilots/demonstrations funded by the GEF through the Project).

However, the additional 56 companies that will benefit from the co-finance (or will provide their own co-finance) are also expected to comply with local regulations on Environmental Impacts, Social Impacts, Labour Legislation, etc. They will be governed by the requirements under ESMF. Risk assessments will be undertaken before accessing to FREEME for financing.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5.6.2022:
Cleared.

5.5.2022:
Budget table: Total of component 2 in the budget table included in Annex E in Portal (\$893,400) is not correct: it should be \$3,893,400 (as shown in Table B) ? please to adjust in all budget tables.

2.9.2022:
Annex B: Response to project reviews is incomplete, as it seems to be missing response to comments from the USA.

Agency Response

5.5.2022:

Thanks for pointing it out. This is a typo where 3 was most likely accidentally deleted after copying-pasting the budget table to the Portal. We checked and all other places are good.

It is noted that the comment from USA Council Member, dated 1/11/2021, concerns with ?supply chain of ASGM production?, we believe this is not intended for the Philippines Green Chemistry project, which does not deal with ASGM sector at all.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5.12.2022:

This CEOER is recommended for technical clearance.

5.11 /5.5 /4.26 /4.25 /4.5/ 2.9.2022

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the change).

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/9/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations