



# Accelerating low-carbon circular economy through cleantech innovation towards sustainable development in Viet Nam

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10886

**Countries**

Viet Nam

**Project Name**

Accelerating low-carbon circular economy through cleantech innovation towards sustainable development in Viet Nam

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

11/17/2022

**Review completed by PM**

12/14/2022

**Program Manager**

Remy Ruat

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**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

**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications and revised co-financing letter

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Pending co-financing clarification.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Pending on clarifications to be provided regarding scope of technologies in connection with project structure, co-financing and GHG emission calculations as detailed below.

Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the below responses on co-financing and GHG calculations.

**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

**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications and revised co-financing letter.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Pending co-financing clarification.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Subject to confirmation based on clarifications regarding co-financing and stakeholder engagement.

Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the below responses on co-financing and stakeholder engagement.

**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 N/A

**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  
**Cleared**

**1/11/2023 :**

Thank you for the revision.

**12/14/2022 :**

Thank you for the clarifications and revised co-financing letter which confirms that all outcomes of the project are supported by a co-financing in line with the project scope.

1. Regarding the categories used in the co-financing table : Viet Nam Environment Protection Fund ?In-kind?: source of co-financing ? please change ?Other? to ?Recipient Country Government?, similarly to the ?loans? line.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications. Given the importance of clarifying the scope of supported technologies through this project and the role of co-financing in the upscaling outcome targetted by the theory of change of the project, a revised co-financing letter from the main co-financier clarifying that its mandate covers all climate change mitigation technologies of this project and that energy efficiency will be eligible to the upscaling to be financed would help to clarify this point.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

The amounts reported on the portal are all supported by co-financing letter confirming their sources and types.

The global amount remains in line with PIF stage although the types and repartition are now adjusted.

- UNIDO : \$50,000 in-kind from recurrent expenditures, 150,000 investment mobilized (grant)

- VNEP : \$9,050,000 investment mobilized (loans), 50,000 in-kind from recurrent expenditures

- ISPONRE : 100,000 \$ in-kind from recurrent expenditures

1. It is noted that no private sector co-financier has been identified during PPG stage so far. It would be relevant to clarify contacts that have been attempted during stakeholder consultations as so far none are reported in the CEO ER.

2. The description of investment mobilized indicates that most public sector financing is an in-kind contribution - a clarification would be useful as most co-financing from public sector institutions so far are identified as investment mobilized in the context of this project.

3. The co-financing letter representing most of the investment mobilized identifies investment in waste management and renewable energy sector but does not mention energy efficiency, which is included in the project scope and objective. In order to confirm the balance, cost to benefits ratio of the project and its full alignment with CCM focal area priorities and main objective stated for this project, a clarification and revision would be useful as to how co-financing for investment in energy efficiency cleantech businesses will be mobilised.

## Agency Response

5 Jan 2023 (UNIDO)

The category of the Viet Nam Environment Protection Fund entry was changed from 'other' to 'Recipient Country Government'.

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

1) Please find the Annex N for the evidence of stakeholder consultation. While no private sector entities have provided co-financing letter at this moment, as outlined in the box below the co-financing table, it is expected that there are certain amount of potential private stakeholders in Viet Nam with the appetite to invest in cleantech innovations, as supported through Output 2.2.4. Such private sector entities will be engaged during the implementation phase.

2) The narrative under the co-financing table was revised by deleting 'Co-financing from the public sector (predominantly in-kind) creates the enabling framework conditions that de-risk the key interventions by the project.'

3) The co-financing by VEPF which consists most of the investment mobilized was confirmed that it will be aligned with the project scope and include 'energy efficiency'. Please find the

attached written communication from the VEPF. Accordingly, the below narrative was included in the table below the list of co-financing:

*The co-financing letter by the VEPF mentions its investment mobilized co-financing will be for environment protection and climate change projects, including waste management, centralized effluent treatment, renewable energy projects. It was confirmed by the VEPF, however, that the co-financing will also cover energy efficiency projects aligned with the project scope. It was noted that the waste related activities are insufficient to meet the GEB results targeted by this project and co-financing will be provided in a balanced way for all eligible technologies outlined in the project activities to maximize project impact.*

#### **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  
**11/17/2022 (RR):**

**Cleared**

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**Cleared**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Yes.

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications under the core indicators table. This is well noted.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the enclosed GHG calculation. It is our understanding that the assessment to be conducted at MTR stage will allow a degree of technology differentiation which will enable to assess the weight of respective technologies accelerated by the project. Thank you for confirming and clarifying this point.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

No adjustment made to the core indicator targets - these are consistent with the result framework in annex A.

1. Thank you for mentioning the submission of a table in an excel format as an annex to the submission as per usual practice. The document is however not enclosed at this stage among the annexes (maybe related to project agency document, also missing) - thank you for the transmission.

2. As identified at PIF stage, an updated estimate following the assessment made during PPG phase was expected considering the revised project scope, and drawing on the GCIP approach to be developed as outlined in annex I of the PFD and in the activities of the related global child project. This is not provided at this stage.

It is our understanding based on the data presented in the CEO ER that methodologies will continue being benchmarked during implementation phase and that a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed as part of project GEFID 10461 (GCIP). Please confirm whether this understanding is correct (this seems to be confirmed by the indications provided in paragraph 149 of the current CEO ER.) or provide clarifications and additional information and status update in case it is not.

**Agency Response**

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- The methodology to be developed under the GCIP will enable to assess a degree of contribution to GEBs by respective technologies accelerated and disseminated by the project. This is added in the explanation under the core indicators table in the CEO Approval Document.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- 1) Apologies for the omission. The excel document of GHG calculation is attached.
- 2) Yes, it is also our understanding that the project will be aligned with the GEFID 10461 (GCIP) and a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed under the GCIP.

**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

**Cleared:**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for highlighting the main changes since PIF stage, which include a focus on businesses including on stage less early than those reflected by the term entrepreneurs, as a result of stakeholder consultations. Thank you as well for the clarity on component 3.

There is an elaboration on root causes and barriers reflecting the integration of renewable energy, energy efficiency and waste management approaches to cleantech, while highlighting the role of circular economy in this context.

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

**Cleared**

Agency Response N/A

**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  
**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications and revised co-financing letter.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Pending co-financing clarification.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Pending on clarification on co-financing above supporting a balanced approach to components of project objectives.

Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on co-financing above.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications and revised co-financing letter.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Pending co-financing clarification.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Pending on clarification on co-financing above supporting a balanced approach to components of project objectives.

Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on co-financing above.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications and revised co-financing letter

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Pending co-financing clarification.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Pending on clarifications on co-financing outlined above.

Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the response on co-financing above.

**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  
**Cleared**

**12/14/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarifications, which are well noted.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the annex - please see the clarification requested on section I.7.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Please see and address the comment in section I.7 of this review sheet on GHG calculations (missing annex).

Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- As mentioned in the above I.7., the methodology to be developed under the GCIP will enable to assess a degree of contribution to GEBs by respective technologies accelerated and disseminated by the project. This is added in the explanation under the core indicators table in the CEO Approval Document.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Apologies for the omission. The excel document for GHG calculation is attached.

**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

**Cleared**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

The potential for scaling up is outlined in more details including through past experiences from similar programs. The innovation and sustainable sections are outlined in a similar manner as in the PIF.

Agency Response N/A

**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  
**Cleared**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Provided in section II.1.b.

Agency Response N/A  
**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 N/A  
**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  
**Cleared**

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the annex. It is our understanding that in spite of the change in wording regarding businesses to be supported, entrepreneurs will remain a key part of the innovators to be accelerated through the project.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

More detailed evidence on stakeholder engagement to date, in particular from the private sector would be useful. References are made to annexes (J) that are not attached to the submission. Among the multiple stakeholders identified in the table in the CEO ER, there is no presence of private sector which relies at this stage only on entrepreneurs benefitting from the project.

## Agency Response

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Yes, the entrepreneurs will remain a key part of the innovators to be accelerated through the project.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the attached Annex N for the evidence of stakeholder consultation as well as Annex J for Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

## **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

**Cleared**

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the annex submission

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Details are provided in the CEO ER. The relevant annex is missing from the submission.

## Agency Response

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Annex K Gender Analysis was provided as a supporting document at the time of CEO submission (roadmap -> document section) but now it is also uploaded within the CEO document.

## **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  
**Cleared**

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the annex, which helps to identify the need for clarification in the co-financing section.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Please see above comment on stakeholder engagement and in section I.4 of this review sheet in co-financing.

Agency Response

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the attached Annex N for the evidence of stakeholder consultation as well as Annex J for Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Please also find the response on co-financing.

**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  
**Cleared.**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the additional details provided regarding alternatives proposed for risk mitigation related to the covid19 context, as identified at PIF stage.

Agency Response N/A

**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  
**11/17/2022 (RR):**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**Cleared.**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Well detailed in relations with Viet Nam's NDC among others.

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**Cleared.**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Yes, linked to the GCIP program. Outlined including the related budget allocations in connection with project outputs and activities (paragraph 203).

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**11/17/2022 (RR):**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**Cleared.**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

At PIF stage, it was identified that further details would be explored during PPG phase regarding linkages with the GCIP program on monitoring and evaluation. This has been done with a scope and indicative budget provided. The detailed M&E Plan remains to be further developed during project kick-start.

Agency Response N/A  
**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  
**Cleared.**

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Yes, this is clearly identified in paragraphs 210 to 214.

Agency Response N/A  
**Annexes**



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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the attachment of annexes.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Several annexes are referenced in the ER but missing in the submission (this may be related to the agency project document which is also missing).

Agency Response  
1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Apologies again for the omission. The relevant annexes are attached.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

**1/11/2023:**

Thank you for the revision

**12/14/2022:**

1. The Project Results Framework table is off the margins (starting at the 'assumptions' column). Please amend so that it is readable when the autogenerated document is web-posted.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Included in annex A. in line with core indicators.

Agency Response  
**5 Jan 2023 (UNIDO)**

The Project Results Framework has been reintroduced and now fits entirely within the margins of the window.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**Cleared**

**1/11/2023:**

Thank you for the addition

**12/14/2022:**

Pending points have been clarified, with a revised co-financing letter from the main co-financier of the project clarifying that the upscaling outcome will be supported in line with the project scope, and a clarification on GEB monitoring.

1. On the budget table in Annex E: please include the column "Responsible Partner" and fill it out accordingly, while ensuring that the table remains within margin limits.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Two remaining clarifications would help to consolidate the CEO ER in order to confirm its technical potential reach targetted impact :

- A revision of the co-financing letter by the main co-financier in order to clarify that the scope will include in an open way the technologies accelerated by the project, including in the distinct areas of renewable energy, energy efficiency and waste.
- Further clarification regarding the monitoring of the project to enable sufficient granularity in the assessment of the CCM GEB targetted by the project.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Elements identified at PIF stage have been addressed regarding :

- knowledge products and tools to be further identified, including in connection with the GCIP program.
- proportionality in PMC from co-financing sources

The following remaining points remain to be further clarified or confirmed :

1. Involvement of the private sector, including as a co-financier, and related stakeholder consultations constrained by the covid-19 context.

2. the theory of change still refers to the GCIP program (paragraph 44) and there remain several instances in the CEO ER where the distinct nature of this cleantech project and the GCIP could be clarified

3. GHG emission reductions assessment mentioned as an annex but not yet transmitted - further methodologies expected initially at PPG stage not available yet - to be applied once explored through the GCIP global project.

4. Balance between components of the project's objective, with energy efficiency not identified in the co-financing and upscaling structure.

## Agency Response

5 Jan 2023 (UNIDO)

As requested, a column with the responsible partner was added to the table which still remains within the margins of the Portal.

13 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

- Please find the attached revised co-financing letter by VEPF.
- The methodology to monitor the CCM GEBs by the project will be aligned with the GEFID 10461 (GCIP) and a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR. As mentioned in the above I.7., the methodology to be developed under the GCIP will enable to assess a degree of contribution to GEBs by respective technologies accelerated and disseminated by the project. This is added in the explanation under the core indicators table in the CEO Approval Document.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

1) Please find the attached Annex N for the evidence of stakeholder consultation as well as Annex J for Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Please also find the response on co-financing.

2) Para 44 is revised to read as following:

44. The proposed advanced cleantech innovation project for Viet Nam is aligned with the global GCIP framework of which UNIDO is a project executing entity. The Theory of Change (ToC) for the Viet Nam cleantech project shows how it will deliver accelerated uptake and investment in SMEs with high-impact cleantech innovation products and services which, in turn, will meaningfully contribute to climate change mitigation targets and to green growth and job creation.

3) Apologies for the omission. The excel document for GHG calculation is included. The project will be aligned with the GEFID 10461 (GCIP) and a more specific and detailed GHG emissions assessment will be conducted by MTR on the basis of methodologies developed under the GCIP.

4) Please find the response at co-financing.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Cleared**

**1/20/2023:**

Thank you for the revision and for the notification regarding glitches with resubmissions - this is well noted.

**1/11/2023:**

There seems to have been an involuntary return to a previous version of the PPG utilization status table, hence the comment below remains to be addressed :

The item ?CEO endorsement request submitted to GEF Sec, with full document package including? is not an eligible activity but an output. Please list the eligible activities/expenditures (i.e. meetings, consultants, etc.) per the content included in Guidelines.

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Thank you for the clarification and details.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

The item ?CEO endorsement request submitted to GEF Sec, with full document package including? is not an eligible activity but an output. Please list the eligible activities/expenditures (i.e. meetings, consultants, etc.) per the content included in Guidelines.

Agency Response

**16 Jan 2023 (UNIDO)**

The PPG table was reversed to the cleared version. This is to kindly let you know that we are currently experiencing similar issues on other resubmissions, i.e. sections missing (e.g. the taxonomy), older versions appearing, or projects not loading. We hope these glitches will disappear soon.

1 Dec. 2022 (UNIDO)

Please find the attached Annex C Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

**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

N/A

Agency Response

N/A

**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 N/A

Agency Response N/A

**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 N/A

Agency Response N/A

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**1/20/2023:**

The last remaining comment has been addressed - for reference, glitches are being experienced during resubmissions for some sections of the CEO ER.

The project is technically cleared.

**1/11/2023:**

Edits have been made on the co-financing table, results framework table and budget table, which are now complete and fully readable.

However the PPG table was reverted back to its previous version which is not in line with the GEF guidelines - a final revision is requested.

**12/14/2022:**

Most remaining points have been addressed. Edits are requested regarding co-financing table (item 1.4 of the review sheet), results framework table (Annexes section of the review sheet under Project Results Framework) and budget table (Annexes section of the review sheet under GEF Secretariat comments).

**12/09/2022 (RR):**

Not yet - final technical comments to be addressed for a re-submission.

**11/17/2022 (RR):**

Not yet - technical comments to be addressed by agency for a re-submission.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>11/17/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/9/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/14/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/11/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/20/2023</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project is recommended for endorsement. Points highlighted at PIF stage for a monitoring during implementation have all been addressed by the agency with clarifications provided to the project structure.

1. Regarding co-financing, justification has been provided on how additional co-financing will be mobilized including through an early stage focus on private sector mobilization, based on the experience of passed similar projects. The co-financing structure has been clarified including in terms of how the investment mobilized will support scaling up accelerated clean technologies in line with the scope of the project, in particular on energy efficiency, renewable energy and other relevant clean technologies with a view to maximize climate change mitigation impact.

2. As the cleantech-specific GHG emission calculation methodologies are currently being explored as part of the GCIP global coordination project, with which this project will share significant synergies, it was not possible to apply them yet and estimates from PIF stage were used, with increased resolution and clarity on the scope of technologies supported, also in alignment with the GCIP. The detailed assessment and related criteria will be applied during implementation and monitored at MTR stage in a way that will enable to identify the contribution of various supported technologies to GHG emission reductions.