

Programme for cleantech innovation and green jobs - Phase 2

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10826

Countries

Morocco

Project Name

Programme for cleantech innovation and green jobs - Phase 2

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

9/28/2021

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project description summary. 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

PM: 6/23/2021

No. Please address the following questions:

- There are some discrepancies in the GEF project financing figures in Table B of the project document and Annex E Project Budget. For instance, as per Table B of the project document total GEF project financing (excluding fees) amount to \$913,242 while in Annex E total GEF project financing is reported as \$913,742. The same applied to PMCs. Please update accordingly so all figures are consistent across.

- The budget figure (Annex E) cannot be read in the portal. Please correct. If needed, one option is to aggregate the budget at component level, instead of outcome level, in the portal while keeping the detailed version in the attached Excel file.

PM: 7/23/2021

No. Comments were addressed and issues were cleared, however please address the following comment as recently discussed with some UNIDO colleagues (including Akos, among others):

- UNIDO has charged a USD 42,400 on direct service costs (such as treasury, payments, procurement services?) but has not requested a partial execution role nor provided a letter from the OFP requesting this role. We would like to kindly remind UNIDO that as

per the GEF guidelines, Implementing Agencies shall use the agency fees for these type of costs (or in this case the global child project). For national child projects, normal rules relative to the separation of functions between implementation agency and executing entity must apply. This means that no direct execution costs (DCS in your documents) can be accepted, except in exceptional circumstances. Any exception for amounts to be directly executed by the IA needs to be:

1. Explicitly requested by the OFP with an official letter stating the amount subject to the direct execution modality
2. A detailed justification needs to be provided by the Agency as of why direct execution is needed, and what other options have been explored for local execution by other actors on the ground that could be supervised by the IA
3. A detailed breakdown of activities that are proposed for direct execution should be provided.

This type of request is submitted through the portal as part of the project documentation, assessed by the GEF PM, which then recommends the exception or not to the GEF Manager for Programs. However, kindly note that this arrangement should be only used in case of exceptional circumstances, such as fragile or conflict countries, with very low capacity, upon request by the GEF OFP.

As such, we kindly ask you to revise the budget template accordingly. We are open for a phone call at any time shall you need any further clarification.

PM: 9/17/2021

No. The Project Expected Implementation Start date has already past, i.e. 9/1/2021. Please update it to a later date.

PM: 9/27/2021

Cleared. The Project Expected Implementation Start date has been updated to 1/1/2022.

Agency Response

UNIDO response: 22 September 2021

The project expected implementation start date is changed to 1 January 2021.

UNIDO response: 24 Aug 2021

The direct service cost (DSC) charged by UNIDO to the project was \$2,400.

Based on the discussion with the GEF Secretariat held in August 2021, the direct service costs and all related text have been removed from the project.

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

Thank you for the comment. Annex E is corrected and the total amount of GEF project financing is \$913,242.

A summary of the budget table is presented in the portal for enhanced readability.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes, with suggestions. As indicated in the project document, we understand that co-financing from the private sector is expected mostly during the implementation of the project, as investment facilitation is one of the key support services to be provided by this project. Please make sure that co-financing is indeed reported periodically to the GEF as per the regular reporting mechanisms to the GEF.

PM: 9/17/2021

No. On co-financing under Table C, the 100K in Grant from the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Environment should be categorized as Public Investment.

PM: 9/27/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO response: 22 September 2021

The 100,000 USD co-financing from the MEME is recategorized as public investment.

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

Mobilisation of co-financing, especially investment into cleantech solutions will continue during the project implementation as investment facilitation is one of the key support services to be provided under outcome 1.2. The PMU will report on the additional mobilization of co-financing through the annual GEF PIRs (Project Implementation Reports), as well as in the mid-term review, and the terminal evaluation (please see paragraph 3 of section 1a).

Paragraph 7 of Section 9 is also updated as below:

7. By referring to the impact and performance indicators defined in the Project Results Framework, the monitoring plan will track, report on and review project activities and accomplishments in relation to GEBs, including energy savings achieved, increased Renewable energy capacity and GHGs emission reductions, among others, generated as a result of the project. The Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for continuous monitoring of project activities implementation, and performance in relation to the project results framework, the gender action plan, environmental and social management plan, stakeholder engagement plan and the risk mitigation plan. The PMU will be responsible for tracking overall project milestones and progress towards the attainment of the set project outputs and will also be responsible for narrative reporting to the GEF. **Co-financing mobilisation efforts and results will also be monitored and reported on through the M&E plan, including through the annual GEF PIRs.** The GEF OFP will be engaged in the M&E activities, such as regularly receiving all project progress reports, and providing inputs and comments, etc.

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A. PPG is not requested for this project.

Agency Response
7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes, with request for clarifications. The CEO Endorsement Request states that the project will focus on cleantech innovation aligned with GEF-7 priorities i.e., e-mobility, renewable energy based mini-grids. As such, we are wondering whether the project shall also report on "Core Indicators 6.3. Energy Saved" and "6.4. Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology". Please clarify and if applicable include a target value for these two indicators.

PM: 7/22/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

The project may be able to report on core indicators 6.3 and 6.4 depending on the types of technologies selected to receive support from the project. Please note that the exact technology categories of the Accelerator will be determined during the review and adaptation of the GCIP guidebooks for Morocco, and therefore it is not possible at this point in time to set a target for energy saved and increase in installed capacity.

The screening criteria for selection of cleantech start-ups into the Accelerator, as well as advanced and post acceleration services will comprehensively assess the technology/solution's potential for contributing to GEBs . The monitoring and tracking of GEBs achieved (including energy saved and RE installed) will be part of the M&E plan both at the programmatic and project levels, and will be reported through the project's Annual Impact Reports, as well as through the annual PIRs.

The monitoring and reporting of GEBs achieved under this project will be guided by the GCIP Framework, and the M&E plan developed under the GCIP coordination project (GEF project ID 10461). All GCIP child projects, including GCIP 2 Morocco will adapt the GCIP M&E plan, which provides methodologies and guidelines for tracking and reporting of all GEBs including RE capacity installed and energy saved.

Paragraph 7 of Section 9 is also updated as below:

7. By referring to the impact and performance indicators defined in the Project Results Framework, **the monitoring plan will track, report on and review project activities and accomplishments in relation to GEBs, including energy savings achieved, increased Renewable energy capacity and GHGs emission reductions, among others, generated as a result of the project.** The Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for continuous monitoring of project activities implementation, and performance in relation to the project results framework, the gender action plan, environmental and social management plan, stakeholder engagement plan and the risk mitigation plan. The PMU will be responsible for tracking overall project milestones and progress towards the attainment of the set project outputs and will also be responsible for narrative reporting to the GEF. Co-financing mobilisation efforts and results will also be monitored and reported on through the M&E plan, including through the annual GEF PIRs. The GEF OFP will be engaged in the M&E activities, such as regularly receiving all project progress reports, and providing inputs and comments, etc.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there 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
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes, with requests for clarification. "Figure 4 Demand for funds and technical support per development stage" is blurred and cannot be read. Please update accordingly. Also, the Theory of Change picture is off the margins in the portal. Please correct.

PM: 7/22/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

Figure 4 and TOC diagrams are reformatted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

8. 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
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes, with request for clarifications. "Figure 6: Alignment of the GCIP 2 Morocco child project with the GCIP Framework" if off margins. Please correct.

PM: 7/22/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

Figure 6 is reformatted.

10. 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
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes, with requests for clarifications. From the project document, we understand the agency has conducted some preliminary discussions with stakeholders during the design phase. If so, please clarify the exact dates/period of time when these consultations took place and the list of stakeholders consulted during the project design.

PM: 7/22/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

Formal consultations with external stakeholders took place mostly in the context of the evaluation of the GEF-6 project "Programme for Cleantech Innovation and green Jobs in Morocco" (GEF Project ID: 9485), conducted between September and November 2020. For the list of stakeholders and persons consulted, please see pg. 76 of its Terminal Evaluation Report (Annex K). Continuous consultations with the main counterpart of the project, namely the Department of Environment within the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Environment (MEME/DE), took place throughout the project development period, from January 2019 until June 2021. There are no separate records of these interactions, and all documents submitted for CEO endorsement approval fully reflect the inputs received from MEME/DE throughout this period. We recognize that the project's impact will be enhanced by ensuring continuous engagement of stakeholders to promote synergies and coordination. Accordingly, component 2 will actively seek to engage other key stakeholders in Morocco. In particular, output 2.1.3 will act as a national platform through which key stakeholders, development partners, and financiers etc. in the ecosystem will collaborate.

Stakeholders

2. An overview of the stakeholders as well as their foreseen roles and engagement modalities in the project is included below. **For further details on the types of stakeholders consulted, the interview questions and responses to questionnaires, please refer to the relevant section of the Terminal Evaluation Report of GEF-6 GCIP 1 (Annex K, pg. 83-110).**

11. 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

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

12. 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
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

13. Risk. 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
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

14. 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
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes, with request for clarifications. "Figure 7: Institutional Arrangement" is off margins in the portal. Please correct.

PM: 7/22/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO: 7 July 2021

Figure 7 is reformatted.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16. 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

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

17. 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

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

PM: 9/27/2021

No. Kindly note there is an inconsistency on the M&E budget. The M&E budget as per Table 16 in Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" is US\$ 60,000, while the M&E budget as per the budget in Annex in Annex E is US\$ 40,000. Please amend to make the figures consistent.

PM: 9/28/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO response 28 Sep2021

M&E budget table in section 9 is corrected so that amount of M&E from GEF financing is 40,000 USD.

18. 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

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

PM: 9/17/2021

No. Thank you for submitting a very comprehensive excel sheet budget. However, the summary budget in the CEO Endorsement document shall be presented in a way that allows the Secretariat to assess which budget categories (civil works, contractual services, consultants, salaries, etc.) are charged to which sources (project's components, M&E, PMC). The current summary budget has only components and outcomes instead of per categories with no sources which impedes to carry out such analysis. For further information, please refer to the budget template in page 46 of the GUIDELINES ON THE PROJECT AND PROGRAM CYCLE POLICY - https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf

PM: 9/27/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO response: 22 September

The budget summary was updated to reflect the comment, and now includes requested details at the outcome level.

20. 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

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes. Council comments have been properly addressed.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

PM: 6/23/2021

Yes.

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

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

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

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

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

PM: 6/23/2021

N/A.

Agency Response
GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The GEF SEC is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address additional comments/requests for clarifications before proceeding with the approval of the project.

PM: 8/31/2021

Cleared. All comments have been addressed and the CEO ER document has been revised accordingly. The PM recommends technical clearance for this project.

PM: 9/17/2021

No. The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address the following minor comments/requests for clarifications (comments also included in the boxes above):

1. Project Expected Implementation Start date has already past, i.e. 9/1/2021. Please update it to a later date.

2. On co-financing under Table C, the 100K in Grant from the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Environment should be categorized as Public Investment.

3. Thank you for submitting a very comprehensive excel sheet budget. However, the summary budget in the CEO Endorsement document shall be presented in a way that allows the Secretariat to assess which budget categories (civil works, contractual services, consultants, salaries, etc.) are charged to which sources (project's components, M&E, PMC). The current summary budget has only components and outcomes instead of per categories with no sources which impedes to carry out such analysis. For further information, please refer to the budget template in page 46 of the GUIDELINES ON THE PROJECT AND PROGRAM CYCLE POLICY - https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf

PM: 9/27/2021

No. While reviewing the updated budget table we found the following inconsistency: the M&E budget as per Table 16 in Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" is US\$ 60,000, while the M&E budget as per the budget in Annex in Annex E is US\$ 40,000. Please amend to make the figures consistent.

PM: 9/29/2021

No. Please address the following comment: When the project staff is charged to both - PMC and project's components (as it is the case for this project: Project Coordinator and Program Assistant are charge to both), as per GEF Guidelines clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval for review by the Secretariat (see paragraph 4 - page 42 of the Guidelines). Please either update the budget so Project Coordinator and Program Assistant's expenses are charge to PMC covered by the GEF and PMC covered by the co-financing OR provide Terms of Reference for the Project Coordinator and Program Assistant which clearly describe the unique outputs linked to the respective components.

Do you have any questions on this last request please feel free to reach out to me at pmarcoshuidobro@thegef.org

PM: 10/6/2021

Cleared.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/23/2021	7/7/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/8/2021	8/25/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		9/22/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		9/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		9/30/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

PM: 9/27/2021

No. While reviewing the updated budget table we found the following inconsistency: the M&E budget as per Table 16 in Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" is US\$ 60,000, while the M&E budget as per the budget in Annex in Annex E is US\$ 40,000. Please amend to make the figures consistent.

PM: 9/29/2021

No. Please address the following comment: When the project staff is charged to both - PMC and project's components (as it is the case for this project: Project Coordinator and Program Assistant are charge to both), as per GEF Guidelines clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval for review by the Secretariat (see paragraph 4 - page 42 of the Guidelines). Please either update the budget so Project Coordinator and Program Assistant's expenses are charge to PMC covered by the GEF and PMC covered by the co-financing OR provide Terms of Reference for the Project Coordinator and Program Assistant which clearly describe the unique outputs linked to the respective components.

all you have any questions on this last request please feel free to reach out to me at pmarcoshuidobro@thegef.org

PM: 10/6/2021

Cleared.