



# The Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10353

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

The Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

11/25/2021

**Review completed by PM**

12/17/2021

**Program Manager**

Anil Sookdeo

**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**

Yes

#### **Agency Response**

**Project description summary**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes

#### **Agency Response**

**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**

**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** Yes and the co-financing has increased from the PIF amount.

**Agency Response**

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** Provided

**Agency Response**

Core indicators

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

The core indicators remain realistic. Please add the detailed description of how the core indicators estimates were arrived at under the core indicator table.

Dec 15, 2021 - Comment addressed

**Agency Response**

7-Dec-21

A detailed description of how the core indicators estimates were arrived at was included under the core indicator table.

**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**

Yes

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

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**

Yes

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes

**Agency Response**

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**

Yes

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes

**Agency Response**

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**

Provided

**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**

N/A

**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**

Yes

## **Agency Response**

**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**

Yes

## **Agency Response**

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

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**

All risks including those due to Covid and climate have been identified and appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed.

## **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**

Yes

**Agency Response**

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**

Yes, well defined.

### **Agency Response**

#### **Annexes**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes

### **Agency Response**

#### **Project Results Framework**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Provided

### **Agency Response**

#### **GEF Secretariat comments**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Please upload the budget table into the main portal document as it cannot be reviews as an annex/attachment.

Dec 15, 2021 - Comment addressed

Jan 12, 2022 - PPO Comments:

1. This Global project that will be executed in 6 countries: Indonesia, Ukraine, Serbia, Peru, Uganda and Jordan. Please include the list of countries next to 'Global?' in Part 1



2. The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B do show some differences between components as following:

- Component 1 in Budget table: \$1,200,000 - Component 1 in Table B: \$1,400,000
- Component 2 in Budget table: \$2,300,000 - Component 2 in Table B: \$4,700,000
- Component 3 in Budget table: \$1,950,665 - Component 3 in Table B: \$5,500,000
- Component 4 in Budget table: \$445,000 - Component 4 in Table B: \$400,000
- M&E in Budget table: \$155,000 - M&E in Table B (which is M&E ? same as above): \$400,000
- PMC in Budget table: \$300,000 - PMC in Table B: \$600,000

Please amend in ALL budget tables ? (important note: we could not find the excel table budget in the documents? tab: please also include it in the resubmission)

3. Co-financing:

- E-Recyklaza (Serbia) ? as per the co-financing letter, split into 2 entries:
  - i. \$354,080 ? Grant & Investment mobilized
  - ii. \$300,000 ? In-kind & Recurrent expenditures
- Innovation Fund of Serbia: as per the co-financing letter, revise the in-kind co-financing amount to \$200,000.

4. Core Indicators: Please include GEF Core Indicators and appropriate targets in Annex A ?Project Results Framework?. So far only indicator 9 (reduced chemicals) is included, but still missing 4 (landscapes) and 11 (beneficiaries). If these indicators are not to be used please remove them.

5. On the budget:

- a. The budget table has been included twice. Please delete 1 of the 2.
- b. We were not able to find detailed information on what the GGINP Support includes. Please include an itemized list of personnel / other associated categories with the correspondent costs that should be absorbed by the PMC portion of the budget (this has to be covered by PMC ? in this case, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 6.2 million)
- c. Office supplies should be charged to PMC

6. The PPG status of utilization table has been incorporated twice and that the budgeted amount does not match de spent amount. Please specify how the unspent amount will be committed.

Feb 16, 2022 - Comments addressed

### Agency Response

7-Dec-21

The budget table has been re-inserted into the main portal document. The images are visible from our end and seem within the allocated margin of the text box.

17-Jan-22

1. Unfortunately, this box is not editable from UNIDO side (please see screen shot below). It originates back to PIF approval.

**Part I: Project Information**

**Name of Parent Program**

**GEF ID**  
10353

**Project Type**  
FSP

**Type of Trust Fund**  
GET

**CBIT/NGI**  
 CBIT  NGI

**Project Title**  
The Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Program

**Countries**  
Global,

**Agency(ies)**  
UNIDO,

**Other Executing Partner** ⓘ  
Yale University

**Executing Partner Type**  
Others

2. Budget tables have been re-checked. Annex U Green Chem budget has been uploaded. Comments on question 5 have also been addressed.

3. -Co-financing for E-Reciklaza has been split into grant and in-kind (please see co-financing letter 11 and last two columns in Table C).

- Co-financing for Innovation Fund of Serbia: As per co-financing letter number 29, co-financing is Euro 31,90 million (US\$ 37,677,644) in Table C. The co-financing letter has been re-uploaded to the relevant column.

4. Core Indicators 6 and 11 have now been included in Annex A, which has also been further streamlined. Core Indicator 4 is not relevant for this project.

5.

a. The budget table has now only been included once.

b. PMC absorbs the project manager in the amount of US\$ 555,663 for 6 years. Office supplies are now charged to PMC (US\$ 44,337). GGINP is personell support to the network and accelerator programme under components 1 and 2.

c. Office supplies are now charged to PMC .

6. Total PPG funds are US\$ 287,616, out of which US& 285,857 have been budgeted and spent. The remaining amount of US\$ 1,759 is committed for revisions until CEO endorsement.

**Council comments**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

The table of responses seems to have an error in being displayed in the portal - please re-upload

Dec 15, 2021 - The Council comments have been addressed during the preparation of the CER.

**Agency Response** The table of responses has been re-inserted.

**STAP comments**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Same comment as above

Dec 15, 2021 - comments addressed

**Agency Response**

7-Dec-21

The table of responses has been re-inserted. Also here, the images are visible from our end and seem to be within the allocated margin of the text box.

**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** Provided

**Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Provided

**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**

Please respond to the comments in the review.

Jan 12, 2022 - Please address PPO comments

Feb 16, 2022 - comments addressed, recommended for CEO endorsement.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	12/3/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	12/15/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	1/12/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	2/16/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**