



Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains - Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains in Cambodia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11170

Countries

Cambodia

Project Name

Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains - Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains in Cambodia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/26/2024

Review completed by PM

11/5/2024

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please change region to Asia.

Nov 5, 2024 - Noted, comment cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 Oct 2024

?The portal does not have a field for Region, only Country. The region in the word document under ?project information? table is Asia (page 2). The portal entry correctly lists Cambodia in country selection.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project summary effectively and concisely conveys the project's key aspects, including the problem, objectives, strategies, and expected outcomes. It also establishes a clear link with the parent program, demonstrating its contribution to the broader goals. The summary adheres to the word count limit, making it a succinct and informative overview of the project.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project design appears to be well-structured and aligned with the GEF's requirements and Cambodia's national priorities. It incorporates key elements such as a clear objective, a sound ToC, appropriate components and outputs, and adequate consideration for gender, knowledge management, and M&E. The PMC is also within the acceptable limit and proportionally allocated. The project demonstrates a strong potential for achieving its objectives and contributing to the broader goals of the GEF Integrated Program.

Agency Response

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project effectively describes the current situation from a systems perspective and demonstrates a well-designed approach to address the identified challenges. The roles of various stakeholders, including the private sector, are clearly articulated, highlighting their contributions to the project's environmental and socioeconomic outcomes. The project recognizes the importance of financial mechanisms and seeks to leverage private sector investment to achieve its objectives.

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project design exemplifies a well-structured and comprehensive approach to addressing the environmental challenges in Cambodia's fashion and construction sectors. It incorporates key elements such as a clear ToC, robust justification for proposed solutions, incremental cost reasoning, and adequate consideration for gender, knowledge management, and stakeholder engagement. The

project's focus on transformation and innovation, coupled with its alignment with the overall program goal and approach, further strengthens its potential for achieving significant and sustainable impacts.

- Overall, the ER is well incorporating both sectors which is not an easy endeavor and makes for a complex project. That said, the team managed to have a clear structure of the components and incorporating critical assumption with conscious transparency. The team should be complimented for that.

- Benefits: The curtailing of sand use in cement by 40 % will have major benefits incl. decreasing the sandmining from river beds and decrease the impacts of excessive sand mining on river banks and deltas.

- Components 1 and 3: has the assumption that construction companies are embracing reverse logistics systems and been verified. While recovery of certain raw materials (such as metal) may be lucrative, the logistics challenge and additional recovery and transport efforts to reuse materials and make them available on demand and the scale needed may not be easy to overcome and be associated with extra costs.

- Please make sure that the detail in terms of fashion and construction sectors are equally attended to in the project component description. In the moment there seems to be more thought given to the construction sector while textiles have a large role in the Cambodia economy. Gender benefits and targeting women entrepreneurs in the garment sector could open large opportunities and decreasing chemicals in the procured textiles to be processed into garments do not only allow for opportunities to recycle obsolete fashion but also decrease workers safety.

- Will the project address support for the design and production of fashion products of greater durability and support marketing, production and business models that will lead to less overproduction of garments (e.g. incl. pre-order; just in time production; etc. other..)?

- Institutional arrangement ? figure 1: project governance structure: please add counterparts for each component with regard to the fashion sector in the diagram. That said, it is good to see that there are two specific National Working Groups for the Fashion and Construction Sector described in the text itself.

Nov 5, 2024 - Comments cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 Oct 2024:

To strengthen the narrative, we have added following in the project description. ?Many companies in Cambodia have yet to formally adopt a reverse logistics system. However, Chip Mong and Shun Wei, operating in the construction and fashion sectors, are actively involved in recycling initiatives and are co-financing partners committed to enhancing the environment for reverse logistics in Cambodia. Their efforts will help address the identified risks and support the project in expanding these practices nationwide?.

We acknowledge the logistics challenges raised and have included them in the updated risk assessment table on the portal (and page 38 of pdf) of the main CEO endorsement document, along with proposed mitigation measures.

Please make sure that the detail in terms of fashion and construction sectors are equally attended to in the project component description. In the moment there seems to be more thought given to the construction sector while textiles have a large role in the Cambodia economy. Gender benefits and targeting women entrepreneurs in the garment sector could open large opportunities and decreasing chemicals in the procured textiles to be processed into garments do not only allow for opportunities to recycle obsolete fashion but also decrease workers safety.

Agency Response 30 October 2024:

The project component description section B (on pages 17-32 of attached pdf) now includes balanced information on both fashion and construction sectors.

- Will the project address support for the design and production of fashion products of greater durability and support marketing, production and business models that will lead to less overproduction of garments (e.g. incl. pre-order; just in time production; etc. other..)?

Agency Response 30 October 2024:

The project will support the pilot implementation of a national ecolabelling scheme for the fashion sector. This will include testing eco-labelled products and may involve initiatives such as pre-ordering and just-in-time production. The text has been added appropriately in the document (highlighted in green for easy reference).

- Institutional arrangement ? figure 1: project governance structure: please add counterparts for each component with regard to the fashion sector in the diagram. That said, it is good to see that there are two specific National Working Groups for the Fashion and Construction Sector described in the text itself.

Agency Response 30 October 2024:

Figure 1 in Appendix 7 on Institutional Arrangement and in main CEO endorsement document (also on page 32 of attached pdf) have been revised to include fashion sector counterpart for each component. The fashion sector counterparts include:

Component 1: SMEs, Ministry of Industry, Science, Technology, and Innovation (MISTI), Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Economy and Finance

Component 2: Cambodia Garment Training Institute (CGTI), International Labour Organization-Better Factories Cambodia (ILO-Better Factories Cambodia), GERES Cambodia, Ministry of Industry, Science, Technology, and Innovation (MISTI), Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training (MLoVT)

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project demonstrates a well-structured approach to institutional arrangements and coordination. It clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities of different entities at various levels and provides a rationale for their involvement. The inclusion of an organogram and a description of the funds flow further enhances the clarity of the institutional setup. The project also emphasizes coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiatives, demonstrating its commitment to building on existing efforts and maximizing synergies. The framework for coordination and collaboration is consistent with the program's ambition for transformative change, ensuring the involvement of diverse stakeholders in achieving the project's objectives.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project demonstrates a strong commitment to monitoring and evaluating its impacts through well-defined core indicators and a transparent methodology. The choice of indicators is consistent with the parent program's priorities, ensuring alignment with the broader goals. The targeted contributions to GEBs appear reasonable and achievable based on the provided assumptions and calculations. While the project doesn't explicitly include GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators, its focus on mitigation can indirectly support adaptation efforts. Overall, the project's approach to monitoring and evaluation is sound and contributes to its potential for achieving significant and sustainable environmental benefits.

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project's risk assessment is well-structured and comprehensive, effectively identifying and addressing potential risks to its outcomes. The mitigation measures are clearly defined and realistic, and the risk ratings reflect the residual risk after considering these measures. The assessment also adequately covers environmental and social risks, demonstrating the project's commitment to sustainability and social responsibility.

While the risk assessment is comprehensive, there might be some areas where additional risks could be considered. For example, the project could face challenges related to data collection and monitoring, especially in the informal sectors of the fashion and construction industries. Additionally, the risk of potential social conflicts or resistance to change from certain stakeholders could be further explored.

Please provide an explanation of risk and mitigation measures for fiduciary under the key risk table.

Nov 5, 2024 - Comments cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 October 2024

Additional risks and mitigation measures, including challenges related to data collection and monitoring, fiduciary risk, and potential social conflicts or resistance from certain stakeholders, have been incorporated into Table 1 (and pages 36-40 of uploaded pdf) of the main CEO endorsement document.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project demonstrates a clear and strong alignment with both the Focal Area objectives and the program objective. Its focus on eliminating hazardous chemicals, promoting sustainable practices, and fostering transformative change in key sectors positions it as a valuable contributor to the GEF-8's strategic priorities and the broader goals of environmental protection and sustainable development.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe project displays a strong alignment with Cambodia's national priorities and strategies. The project's strong alignment with national, regional, and global priorities and policies enhances its relevance and potential for impact. By addressing key environmental challenges in Cambodia's fashion and construction sectors, the project contributes to the country's sustainable development goals and supports broader efforts to protect the environment and human health.

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The provided document does not explicitly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to. The text mentions that the project aims to enhance biodiversity through improved landscape management, but it does not specify the exact targets this action aligns with. The project's focus on reducing hazardous chemicals and waste can indirectly contribute to several biodiversity targets, but the specific linkages are not clearly articulated.

To enhance the project's alignment with the Global Biodiversity Framework, it would be beneficial to explicitly identify the relevant targets and describe how the project's activities will contribute to their achievement. This would strengthen the project's impact on biodiversity conservation and demonstrate its commitment to the global biodiversity agenda.

Nov 5, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 October 2024

Following text has been added ?The project will directly contribute to Target 7 (b) and (c) of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework by reducing the emissions of highly hazardous chemicals and synthetic fabric waste cuttings production.?

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

SE: The Stakeholder Engagement Plan reference, in table 1, ?Project country citizens? and vulnerable groups. However, table 3, Stakeholder engagement in project implementation does not include any information on this stakeholder group and local communities and CSOs. Please provide additional information on their role in project implementation and means and timing of engagement.

Nov 5, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 October 2024

Table 3 in Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been revised to include ?project country citizens? stakeholder group including vulnerable groups, local communities and CSOs) and their role in project implementation and means and timing of engagement.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Please take note to financially close the PPG in due time and return any unspent balance to the Trustee.

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 October 2024

This is well noted.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please submit the co-financing letters for Chip Mong Insee Cement Corporation amount of \$12,000,000 and Ministry of Environment, Kingdom of Cambodia amount of \$9,450,000.

Please provide detailed information on the nature and allocation of the in-kind contributions (e.g., staff wages, facilities, travel, transportation) for all sources of co-financing. For now, you may include this information in the cofinancing description field in Annex A or within the applicable sections of the form. However, please ensure that these details are also included in cofinancing letters for future projects.

Nov 5, 2024 - Comments Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 October 2024

Co-finance letter for Chip Mong Insee Cement Corporation and Ministry of Environment are now provided in Appendix 2. The description of nature and allocation of the in-kind contributions is partly described in the letters and is now also provided in co-finance description field in Annex A. ?

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

ESS: We note that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF).

SRIF said that "before implementation of the proposed minimum of 4 construction and 8 fashion small and medium enterprises (SMEs) pilots on sustainable energy projects, appropriate E&S assessments should be undertaken to manage risks that can arise from them. Consider providing technical assistance to the EA for the development/enhancement of a Project-Specific Grievance Mechanism". In addition, the environmental and social risk section of the Key risks table in the Portal says "appropriate E&S assessments will be undertaken to manage risks that can arise from them".

However, it is not clear how and when the project will develop an E&S assessment and management plan as stated in the SRIF and the Key risk section in the Portal.

Please provide a plan to prepare an E&S assessment, management plan, and grievance mechanism, particularly related to the Safeguard Standards 3 and 4 with budget, timeline, and responsibility.

Nov 5, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response 30 October 2024

Planning for the E&S assessment, management plan and grievance mechanism, particularly related to the Safeguard Standards 3 and 4, will take place at the inception phase. This will happen in year 1 of the project. The E&S assessment will be done and the ESMP and grievance mechanism will then be developed early in year 1 of the project. Following review and approval by the Implementing Agency, it will be transmitted to participating countries so that risk management planning and implementation of mitigation measures at the country level can commence from the second half of year 2 onwards. Monitoring of the measures will be integrated into the overall project risk monitoring e.g. during PSC meetings and the annual PIR process.

Budget: \$3-4K and to be allocated from gender and safeguard consultant budget line.

Timeline: Year 1

Responsibility: Gender and safeguard consultant and M&E consultant hired by designated EA. Please refer to the Terms of Reference (Annex 5e) which specifies these tasks for this consultant and the M&E consultant.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a. Office consumables and equipment should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project components. Please revise the budget.

b. Please explain what ?Sub Contracts to UN Organizations? and to ?SSFA, PCAs, non UN? mean. Does this mean UNEP is planning to sign letter of agreement with either other UN organizations or non-UN organizations to carry out some part of the project activities.

c. Please add a column indicating the responsible executing entity for each budget line item in the budget table

Nov 7, 2024 - . Budget table:

a. The table is duplicated in the CEO Endorsement Request PDF (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted). Please remove the table pasted in the field dedicated to the explanation of the budget table.

Nov 11, 2024 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response October 2024?

a. *The budget has been revised and provided in Appendix 4.*

b. *UNEP Implementing Agency (IA) is planning to sign one agreement with Ministry of Environment, Cambodia as the lead executing agency. MoE will oversee all project budget lines and required sub-contracts for fashion sector interventions. UNEP will also have an agreement with UNDP (Sub Contracts to UN Organizations) as the supporting executing agency responsible for construction sector.*

?c. *The column indicating responsible executing entity for each budget line has been added to the budget table in revised Appendix 4.*

Agency Response 7 November 2024??

a. The budget table pasted in the explanation section in the portal has now been deleted as requested. The duplicate table should therefore not appear in the CEO Endorsement Request PDF generated by the portal.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 7, 2024 - Please see comment on the budget table.

Nov 11, 2024 - Comments addressed and project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request During project implementation, the PIRs, MTR and TE should include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	9/6/2024	10/30/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	11/7/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		