



Circular solutions to plastic pollution in Morocco

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11192

Countries

Morocco

Project Name

Circular solutions to plastic pollution in Morocco

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

6/25/2024

Review completed by PM

8/15/2024

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

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 update the region.

Please delete mixed & other. This field is only for CCM.

UNDP will be the EA while UNIDO is the IA.

ES, 11/4/24: Comments cleared.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a) This is the MENA region, we kindly request GEFIT support to amend the region from the back-end.
- b) Addressed - Removed
- c) The Table shows UNIDO as IA and UNDP as EA

a

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

No, please fill out the rio markers.

ES, 11/4/24: Comments cleared.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a) Rio markers filled out

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 Request

The GEBs and other benefits are missing in the summary, please add. Please shorten to meet the limit of 250 words, focusing on the most essential aspects of the project.

ES, 11/4/2024: The summary need work. It should focus on the summary of the project, not the country situation. The GEBs should include the amounts that will be addresses.

ES, 11/15/24: Comment addressed.

Agency Response

11/15/24 UNIDO

Addressed. Summary has been updated to include GEBs.

3 October 2024-UNIDO

a) Summary reduced to 250 words and GEBs and benefits included

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 Request

Please revise to make co-financing contributions to PMC proportional to GEF-financing contributions.

PMC is 5.26% of GEF Financing (and 5.00% of total cost). Please provide a clearer rationale for the justification or revise the PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.2%, for a co-financing of \$300,000,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,756,167 instead of \$500,000 (which is 0.94%). The justification provided is not acceptable as all other projects efficiently conduct management activities with 5% - please ask the Agency to reduce to 5% (for co-financing it will require to increase up to 5% of 53 million).

On Monitoring and Evaluation:

Please include the expected outcomes (included in component 5)

Please charge the audits to the PMC

ES, 11/4/2024: These have been adjusted. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a) a)CF has been adjusted and is proportional to GEF grant for PMC.
- b) b) PMC adjusted to be 5% of component/M&E costs not the full GEF grant.
- c) c) Link to the overall M&E of the IP/Global CP added
- d) d) Annual audits are now charged to PMC

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 Request

Component 4: Engaging private sector to anticipate the need for highly recyclable materials to contribute to component 3 will be challenging given the lack of bio-based materials in Morocco.

Engagement with the Consumer Goods Forum should be facilitated through the global project to assist Morocco (and other countries in the IP) to link with resources and research to support Component 4.

Financial institutions listed on page 20 is also an area that could link well to the global project.

The Project will establish the links between the private sector players and each of the financial and non-financial institutions that could contribute to fund any potential investment, and the focus with SMEs could link to larger corporates and platforms which should be explored.

For example, Coca-Cola which has 4 plants in Morocco centered in Casablanca states that their first sustainability goal is to:

Preserve the value of our packaging materials and our environment by increasing the reduction, reuse and recycling of our packaging and ensuring that it does not end up in our shared waterways or in the environment.

Also, as stated in Box 4, there is a major focus on SUP in beverage containers.

The four pilot initiatives in Component 3 could be informed by research from the Consumer Goods Forum and support these pilots.

It seems that the focus on SMEs in component 4 might not be sufficient to address the material challenges of plastic pollution in Morocco given the focus is on SUP in the beverage sector, which is almost exclusively represented by multi-nationals. Also major corporates could serve as a source of co-finance.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a. Already acknowledged in ?barriers? in Project Rationale and text added to C3 and C4
- b. Text on linking with (for example) Consumer Goods Forum added to Project Rationale and Project Description
- c. Further links to Global CP made throughout the document
- d. Whilst the focus on is on assisting SMEs, larger industry organisations will be invited to workshops etc. to enable an exchange of ideas and experiences. Potentially this could lead to additional CF during project execution.

- e. Noted ? for consideration and further exploration during the inception phase in component 4 ? text added to C4 introduction
- f. Noted ? this box (along with most component descriptions) has moved to a new annex S (Details of project Components, Outputs, Activities and supporting information)
- g. Additional text included in C3 on project identification and prioritization to reflect the important role of the global CP and international initiatives and where additional cofinance may be sought. (new annex S)
- h. Whilst the focus of C3 and C4 is on SMEs the text has been expanded to indicate that larger organisations would be invited to participate in workshops/training programmes to benefit from the lessons identified and to offer advice and suggestions. Text also included to suggest that the participation of larger organisations may lead to the generation of in-kind financial support when results and lessons shared. (text included in C4 introduction and in Annex S)

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 Description is significantly longer than expected, kindly shorten and make text more concise.

The project objective is clear but could be made more measurable by defining why a transition towards a circular economy is desirable (to reduce plastic leakage into the environment? to protect ecosystems/human health? etc.)

The ToC is generally well aligned with the IP but lacks clarity on how impacts links to the overall vision. The intermediate states focus on practical measures and intermediate impacts can be more clearly stated, especially with focus on GEBs and the underlying science. I.e. what does it mean that ?Reduction of plastic pollution improves the health of people, wildlife and habitats?? Key assumptions are included in the TOC.

Some project components include downstream activities that cannot be funded by GEF under this IP:

- ? -- Component 1 ? first paragraph on p. 28 states that the project approach will include segregation and processing of plastics from the F&B sector. Please clarify if this refers to end-of-life management of plastic waste, and if so, please revise text.
- ? --- Component 3 ? under output 3.2 the activities on Enhancing Recycling Infrastructure cannot be covered by GEF funding.

In general, midstream interventions are not as clearly defined as the upstream. Four potential pilots are outlined under Component 3. Please provide further clarification on timeframe for prioritization if this, to ensure that they can be well incorporated in the projects, and inform other aspects of the project.

Under Component 4 South-South exchanges with other African countries such as Kenya and Rwanda are proposed. The project can coordinate with other African countries in the IP (South Africa, Senegal, Burkina Faso, Nigeria) for such exchanges.

Component 5 is lacking key coordination with the global project. Please work with the lead agencies to develop this and reference the google doc check list created.

How will this project build off and coordinate with other ongoing efforts in the country such as GPAP?

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a. Text reduced from 33 pages to 13 with the specific details of project outputs and activities included in a new annex. The PPG has established a wealth of information on the background and details of the components, outputs and activities and these are now included in Annex S
- b. The Objective expanded to read: To accelerate the transition towards a circular economy for plastics in the food and beverage sector of Morocco through the adoption and enhancement of circular approaches to reduce stress on ecosystem and human health.
- c. The project design has been elaborated in close consultation with national experts, the responsible ministry and wider stakeholder community engaged in reducing plastic waste in the F&B sector. The Intermediate Steps have been slightly enhanced but the impact statement is considered clear.
- d. Noted and adjusted ? see below (e-h)
- e. C1 ? text adjusted in the introduction to exclude segregation
- f. Text in 3.2 clarified to remove ?infrastructure? and focus on enhance recycling potential
- g. The proposed timeline for the pilots (shown in Annex Q) is expanded in the text in C3 (presented in new annex S)
- h. In Output 4.3 the South -South exchanges have been broadened with ?and with other child projects within this overall GEF Integrated Programme?
- i. Standardised text provided by the Global Child Project has been added to Component 5 and to M&E text.
- j. During the PPG development phase an initial exploratory meeting has been held with GPAP to understand their interests and potential activities in Morocco. Whilst there are no concrete plans to initiate work in Morocco yet there is an expectation to identify potential initiatives where this project could collaborate with GPAP, further offering potential opportunities for additional co-financing. This will be further developed as implementation of the GEF project is undertaken and the priorities of GPAP in Morocco are confirmed.

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 Request

For the PSC the GEF should be removed. The GEF will participate in the PSC for the global project but not the 15 country projects in this IP.

The GEF-7 Sustainable Cities IP project in Morocco (implemented by UNDP) includes a review of national urban frameworks, which could be informed by the Plastic IP's work on upstream regulations on pollutants and EPR. The business plans for waste management developed in the Sustainable Cities IP potentially could be linked to consumption practices and recyclable materials covered in the Plastics project. The project is encouraged to coordinate with UNDP for coordination and learning.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a. GEF removed from the PSC
- b. Text added to arrangements/coordination on possible links with the sustainable cities IP project in Morocco

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 Request

CI.6 has been reduced significantly compared to the PFD (182,314 vs 406,560). The duration of accounting has been decreased from 10 to 4 years, please provide a rationale for this. Note that for GHG emissions reduction, a longer timeframe beyond project duration can be considered.

CI.7 target has been removed, please provide explanation.

No targets are included under Core Indicator 5 on marine habitats under improved management. Given the project description, the project may be able contribute to this indicator. Please review and add target if relevant.

While country projects can contribute to IW learn no project budget should be contributed. The global project will take the lead on contributing to IW learn.

The number of beneficiaries seems low for this type of project.

ES, 11/4/2024: For CI 6 the duration should be returned to 10 years from 4 years. Ten years is standard for CI 6. Please adjust accordingly.

ES, 11/15/24: Comment addressed.

Agency Response

11/15/24 UNIDO

CI 6 has been updated, duration has been changed from 4 years to 10 years in CI table. Annex R.2 has been updated accordingly.

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a) The Excel tool provided for the calculation is based on a 10 year horizon. The National plastics expert disagreed with the inclusion of 'emissions avoided from the burning of cables and other plastics' in step 3. They did not consider this a relevant source in Morocco. We have followed this recommendation and have reached a projection of 182,314 tonnes of CO2 avoided.
- b) This indicator was not removed, it had been set at 1. While not interacting directly with other countries this project will develop approaches to reduce plastic waste entering the Mediterranean Sea. A figure of 1 had been entered for CI 7
- c) We do not have sufficient meaningful information on the area of marine habitats and are unable to provide a robust estimate now. This CI will be considered again at the MTE and if relevant information is available will be included in PIRs and other reports
- d) Reference to 1% of budget contribution to IWL removed
- e) This figure has been discussed with national stakeholders and is considered to be a conservative but realistic estimate at this stage. It represents approximately 25% that was presented in the PFD for all projects. This will again be reassessed (including through wider stakeholder engagement) annually and adjusted in the MTE if additional information suggests that the figure needs to be adjusted

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

Please adjust the rating under the 'Environmental and Social' risk category in line with the ESS risk category. The ratings are not in line as is. Doing so would be in line with the description of the 'Environmental and Social' risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: 'The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage.'

Under the Environmental and Social category, please avoid providing a cross-reference to the document and provide a summary assessment and mitigants.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

- a) The Risks table has been corrected to show ESS level as 'Low' in accordance with the ESS annex
- b) Summary of risks and mitigations as presented in ESMP included in table

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 RequestNA

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 RequestYes.

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 Request Yes.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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

Please ensure that elements of the Gender Mainstreaming Strategy are linked to the Project Components. Please ensure that gender activities are budgeted and during project implementation, the PIRs, the MTE and the TE should include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

a) Gender targets and indicators are included in the PRF and will be reported in the PIRs etc. Terms of references for both the Safeguards expert and a Gender Expert are included in Annex H ? Outline ToRs for Project Staff (both having responsibilities for the GAP). Detailed budgeting will be undertaken during the Inception Phase that will define specific tasks for the GAP implementation and monitoring. Gender is specifically identified in the titles of Activities 1.2.1, 2.1.1 and 5.1.1 (as shown in the GEF budget) and the GAP covers all the activities of the project.

Was already included in CEO annex (PRF, ToRs and GAP)

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

We note that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as low, and UNIDO attached the Social and Environmental Screening and ESMP. However, the environmental and social risk of the Key risk section in the Portal is moderate. Please make these risks consistent and revise.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

a) Risk table rating corrected to show LOW and the assessment/mitigation text is summarised reflecting this rating

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 RequestYes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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

The amounts do not add up for each category. [Budgeted amount] = [Amount Spent To Date] + [Amount Committed]. Please request the agency to amend.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

a) Amended

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 RequestYes.

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

There is not a diverse set of co-financing and no co-financing from the private sector which is expected in this type of project.

The co-financing from MTEDD consists of USD 53 million in Public Investment (Investment Mobilized) and USD 300,000 in-kind (Recurrent Expenditures). These should be recorded as two separate entries in the GEF Portal form, with the same co-financing letters attached for both entries.

The USD 132,000 in-kind contribution from UNIDO lacks information on its intended use. We suggest including a high-level usage description in the Portal's co-financing description field. For future projects, please ensure this information is included in co-financing letters.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

a) The PPG phase has significantly exceeded the expectations on the level of co-financing. We state multiple times that the project will identify further CF parties during execution building on the work undertaken during the PPG phase to develop, and agree, draft MoU to facilitate industry to access financial resources from banks and other financial institutions in partnership with the Ministry. Clearly this project co-financing can not be defined until the pilot projects have been identified, agreed and specific private sector partners identified. This will occur within the first year of project execution.

b) Changed in the portal

c) The in-kind contribution of USD 132,000 spans the entire project duration and encompasses equipment, knowledge products, and various support elements derived from other relevant UNIDO projects. This contribution will directly aid the implementation and alignment of project activities. For future projects, we will ensure such details are explicitly outlined in both the co-financing description field and co-financing letters.

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 Yes.

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 RequestYes.

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 RequestYes.

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 Request

Core indicator have been included.

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 RequestYes.

Agency Response

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

The table misses the column of executing partner for each expenditure category - please ask the Agency to amend.

In Annex G of the attached CEO Endorsement Portal view (which is the document circulated for review and later posted once endorsed) there are two different budget tables: one goes from page 93 to 99, the other from page 100 to 105. Please ask the Agency to leave only one table, preferably the last one that follows the GEF template.

ES, 11/4/2024: Comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

3 October 2024-UNIDO

a) In the Excel sheet the last column in the final version (?Responsible Entity?) is completed

b) Budget pasted in the portal as outcome level only as a summary, Annex G in the attachment has the full detailed budget

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

No at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 11/11/24: Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 11/15/24: Comments addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/15/2024	10/4/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/15/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		