

The Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10353

Countries

Global (Indonesia, Jordan, Peru, Serbia, Uganda, Ukraine)

Project Name

The Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

10/9/2019

Review completed by PM

3/25/2020

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however there is substantial grant co-financing identified as investment mobilized from the private sector through “institutional support from existing programmes”. It is not very clear how this has been identified as grant and investment mobilized. Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

April 8, 2020 - Comment addressed and cleared.

Agency Response

As per the GEF co-financing guidelines, investment mobilized is co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures. This definition has been duly taken into consideration during the identification of the investment co-financing that will support the implementation of this project.

Indeed, the investments that will be mobilized through the innovation and entrepreneurship programmes were identified in existing national and regional initiatives, from both the private and public sector. These investments support and promote innovation and entrepreneurship through competitions, awards or direct funding to entrepreneurs and their businesses. These initiatives directly target and benefit SMEs, start-ups, researchers, universities as well as large enterprises in the countries

and regions involved in this project. Hence, this mobilized investment will directly support the achievement of the project's objectives and further confirmation as well as supporting evidence will be provided at CEO Endorsement stage. The explanation in the PIF under the co-financing table has been strengthened.

Moreover, a detailed breakdown of the programs' names as well as the potential funds that will be invested towards the project is presented in annex E, attached to this submission.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The PPG request is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. This project seeks to incubate and accelerate the adoption of green chemistry to find sustainable solutions for several chemicals in key manufacturing sectors including textiles, plastics etc. This project can transform these sectors so that they are not only free of toxic substances, but as a result of designing out these toxic chemicals the materials can more easily be recovered and recycled. This project if properly coordinated with other GEF investments that support moving towards a circular economy can have far reaching benefits as the project will seek to remove toxic chemicals from materials that cannot be recycled or recovered as a result of the inclusion of these chemicals.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This PIF has a very weak description on relevant gender dimensions despite the fact that it mentions that Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment are woven into the fabric of each component of the PIF. While, there are some well thought out planned actions (including efforts to support women-led ventures and women

entrepreneurs and recording gender disaggregated data), the PIF should try to provide more information on any analytical work that may have been carried out so far to support the planned actions.

April 8, 2020 - Comment addressed and cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO considers gender mainstreaming as a key strategy for achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women. As a result, reference was made to the Organization's policy and strategy on gender which will guide, along with the GEF's Gender Implementation Strategy, the project's activities. A brief overview of the preliminary gender assessment was included in order to illustrate the reason behind the gender perspective in the PIF. Moreover, activities that reflect gender mainstreaming across the components were described (please note that the list was not exhaustive, as the gender action plan will be developed during the PPG stage). Finally it was specified that gender indicators will be introduced in the results-based framework of the CEO Endorsement, in consultation with the UNIDO Gender Office.

The gender aspects have been strengthened in the PIF and the changes are highlighted in yellow.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This project works with the private sector to identify, incubate and accelerate solutions for removing toxic chemicals out of the supply chains of materials and also will foster the development of new SMEs in this space.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however Section 5 of the PIF show evidence of some climate change risks screening, but they should be able to, at this stage, provide a preliminary ESS screening report/checklist in line with UNIDO’s Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures. Please ask UNIDO whether this screening has taken place and if so that they provide the report. If the report is not available at this stage, UNIDO should provide some additional information on the preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as on the types of risks identified and any preliminary measures to address these identified risks/ potential impacts. If no environment and social safeguard information is available at this stage, UNIDO should provide a justification for this and information on any plans to conduct environmental and social screening/assessments prior to CEO Endorsement.

April 8, 2020 - Comments addressed and cleared.

Agency Response

As per UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP), the project has been categorized as “B”. Category B projects are likely to have less adverse impacts on human populations or environmentally important areas than those of Category A projects. As a result, an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will be developed during the PPG phase. The UNIDO Environmental and Social screening has been uploaded. Furthermore, a clarification has been included under the risks table.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This project has the potential to coordinate with several planned GEF investments that seek to support a move to a circular economy and the project should during the PPG phase seek out these opportunities for collaboration and partnership.

Agency Response

The comment is duly noted.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project has not been reviewed since it is missing endorsement letters from the countries in which demonstration activities are to take place, as such the submission is incomplete and will only be reviewed once the endorsement letters are provided.

March 25, 2020 (AS) - Please address the comments in the relevant sections above. Also please enter the countries participating in the project into the project information section of the PIF. The countries should be entered together with Global (Indonesia, Jordan, Peru, Serbia, Uganda and Ukraine).

April 8, 2020 - All comments have been satisfactorily addressed and the project is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

This project seeks to incubate and accelerate the adoption of green chemistry to find sustainable solutions for several chemicals in key manufacturing sectors including textiles, plastics etc. This project can transform these sectors so that they are not only free of toxic substances, but as a result of designing out these toxic chemicals the materials can more easily be recovered and recycled. This project if properly coordinated with other GEF investments that support moving towards a circular economy can have far reaching benefits as the project will seek to remove toxic chemicals from materials that cannot be recycled or recovered as a result of the inclusion of these chemicals.

This project represents a significant step forward for GEF investments in chemicals and wastes as it moves to the start of the supply chain of several materials, such as plastics and textiles to design out the use of toxic chemicals that prevent the safe end of life management of them. Poor end of life management results in the emissions of POPs and mercury. The project will significantly advance the ability to move towards a circular economy but making these materials recoverable and recyclable since they will be designed without toxic chemicals which would prevent their reuse.