

AIM-WELL: Algeria Integrated Management of Waste Energy at the Local Level

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10080

Countries

Algeria

Project Name

AIM-WELL: Algeria Integrated Management of Waste Energy at the Local Level

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

1/25/2023

Program Manager

Ming Yang

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Yes. The project is aligned with GEF 7 strategy of CCM 1-3: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs - Cleantech innovation

3/2/2021 MY:

Please see the file entitled "Emails between UNDP and the GEF 3-2-2021" in the Document Folder of the project, revise the project package and resubmit it. Thank you.

1/16/2022 MY:

Not yet.

Please address the comments on 3/2/2021, see above.

1/20/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

The PM reviewed the co-financing letters that were submitted to the GEF Portal on January 20, 2022. Only the UNDP's co-financing letter matches the co-financing amount in Table C. Please see below:

Subject : Co-financing letter for the project " AIM-WELL: Algeria Integrated Management of Waste Energy at the Local Level"

Madam,

I am pleased to confirm UNDP Algeria's contribution of US\$ 250,000 as cash co-financing to the above-mentioned project over the period from March 2020 to March 2025.

This strategic project provides an excellent platform for the Government of Algeria to pilot the integrated management of waste energy at local level. It is fully aligned with national priorities, Algeria's Country Programme Document 2016-2020 and the Strategic Cooperation Framework 2019-2021 between the UN and the Government.

Please use the above format to indicate clearly co-financing in cash, or in-kind, or in equity in the co-financing letters. Please provide co-financing letters from individual co-financers. If a government organization issues a letter to cover multiple co-financers, please ask each co-financier to issue a letter that authorizes the government organization to sign the co-financing letter. Thank you.

1/28/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

On the January 26, 2022 resubmission, the Agency did not attach original co-financing letters of the national government. Please resubmit the these letters.

Document Title	Category	Prefix	Classification	Last Modified Date	Published
PIMS 6163 AIM-WELL Responses to GEFSec Comments 25Jan2022 (003)	Project Review Document	Agency response matrix	Public	1/26/2022 6:59 PM	
6163_Algeria_AIM_new co-financing letter from Gov	Project Supporting Document	Co-financing letter	Public	1/26/2022 6:57 PM	

2/1/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

The Agency did not take any actions to address the comments on 1/28/2022 MY. There has no additional document uploaded to the project document folder since 1/26/2022. Please address the comments and resubmit the CEO ER package.

2/18/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

Having consulted with his PPO colleagues regarding the co-financing letters, the PM list the following major issue to be cleared by the Agency:

As per the co-financing letters, it is not possible to understand and verify how the Government co-financing will materialize. There is no information in the letters to indicate if the co-financing is in-kind, public investment or investment mobilized. As per GEF co-financing guidelines (Please refer to the third screenshot below): *?supporting evidence should include the type of co-financing provided?.* As such, the co-financing letters (except the UNDP one) are not acceptable. Please use the UNDP co-financing letter format to get new co-financing letters from other project co-financiers.

12/2/2022 MY:

Please address the following comments from the GEF PPO unit:

1. On core-indicators:

a. The target for the core indicator 6 in the core indicator table and annex A (results framework) does not match. Please correct the figure to reflect the actual target at the project completion.

b. Neither the M&E Plan, nor the Results Framework, describe the means of verification, sources, frequency of updates and responsible parties. Please include those in the template.

2. On gender:

a. Outputs 2.4, 2.6 and 2.8, as specified in the Gender Action Plan, aim at providing economic benefits (including jobs) to women. This category of gender-responsive measure that the project expects to address should be Yes (see green arrow in an email from the PM to Melissa Hernandez <melissa.hernandez@undp.org> of the UNDP New York Office at 4:53pm on 12/2/2022).

b. Please include under Outcome 4 Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation, plans for monitoring and evaluation of the Gender Action Plan.

3. The project results framework in Annex A is slightly off margins. Please make sure it fits within the margins. Same comment for part B of the ESS.

4. On the utilization of the PPG in Annex C: please include the difference between the budgeted amount and the amount spent to date in the amount committed (\$ 1,365). Please exclude any cents from the numbers and round up to the next dollar. Also the presentation of the status of PPG is per output (Preparatory Technical Studies, Formulation of UNDP-GEF Project Document) instead of per eligible expenditure as included in Guidelines ? please amend.

5. On the budget: The salary of the Project Coordinator and the project manager are being charged across components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing allocated to PMC is 1.0 million, and some co-financing is represented in grants. Please review and make changes accordingly. Please also include the responsible Entity in the right hand-side column.

For more detailed information on the comments, please read the email from the PM to Melissa Hernandez <melissa.hernandez@undp.org> of the UNDP New York office at 4:53pm on 12/2/2022.

1/30/2023 MY:

Not completed yet.

While most of the PPO's comments on December 1, 2022 were addressed, two comments remained unaddressed.

Please continue addressing the following comments of the GEF PPO:

- Core Indicators: In respect to core indicator 6, the agency has not addressed the comment. The core indicator table indicates both direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions mitigated. In the annex A (results framework table) the agency has only reflected on partial direct GHG mitigated and the indirect GHG is also missing.

- Comment 4 was partially addressed. The table is still missing the difference between the budgeted and spent to date amount (difference = \$ 1,365). This number should be reflected in the column Amount committed.

2/3/2023 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed.

Agency Response

02/03/2023

- Core-indicators:

The Annex A of the CEO ER and Section V of the UNDP Project Document (project results framework) are revised to include the indirect GHG emissions. The table shows now both direct and indirect mitigated GHG emissions, as per the Core indicators.

- PPG table: the difference is now reflected in the column Amount committed. Kindly refer to the table in Annex C of the CEO ER. The Agency reminds that this amount has already been returned to the GEF Trustee.

01/24/2023

1. On core-indicators:

a. Core indicators in the core indicator table and annex A (results framework) are aligned to reflect the actual target at project completion. The confusion came from the fact that the core indicator table was reflecting direct post project figures instead of actual project completion target. In summary, these are the project targets:

- Total direct GHG emission reduction (5-year project lifetime) = 357,279 tCO₂e

- Total direct (post-project) GHG emission reduction (15-year equipment lifetime) = 4,301,757 tCO₂e

- Total indirect GHG emission reduction = 12,905,271 tCO₂e

b. In fact, the means of verification, sources, frequency of updates and responsible parties are detailed in the Monitoring plan. Please refer to the template in Annex Q of the CEO ER and Annex B of the UNDP Project Document.

2. On gender:

a. The Portal is updated accordingly.

b. Activity 4.2.2. of Outcome 4 will be monitoring the plans. Act. 4.2.2 Monitoring of project plans: The UNDP-GEF project is accompanied by various plans including Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex L), mitigation plan for project risks (Risk Register in Annex N), and Gender Action Plan (Annex M). These plans will be reviewed according to the monitoring and evaluation requirements.

3. Layout improved.

4. The amount entered on the Portal (\$ 0.00) is final because PPG was financially closed on March 28, 2022. There is no amount committed. PPG balance in the amount of \$ 1,364.77 has been returned to GEF. In addition, All components are as per the guidelines;

? Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies and Reviews

? Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes

? Component C: Validation Workshop and Report.

5. As per GEF recommendations, cash co-financing is increased to cover part of the Project Manager and Project Coordinator salaries. From the \$250,000 of UNDP cash co-financing, \$100,000 is moved from Component 1 to PMC. Salaries previously charged on Outcome 1 from GEF budget are removed. Please see changes in the UNDP Prodoc, section 9, Total budget and work plan.

With respect to the roles (of both Project Coordinator and Project Manager), it is suggested to retain these positions presented partly under PMC and partly across components, as these roles will also provide some technical assistance (about 40%). Please refer to the Project Coordinator and Project Manager TORs in the CEO Endorsement Request and Annex D of the Prodoc. Technical assistance of the Project Management Unit is critical with respect to defining the technical specifications of the waste management: collection, treatment, recycling, and generation of energy. The Unit will provide assistance in architectural concept design and preparation of engineering in close cooperation with the various stakeholders. It will also be supporting most of the Knowledge Management activities (Outcome 4). The idea behind the Project coordinator technical assistance is to have someone dedicated to the project full-time, instead of short-term consultancies throughout the project.

The Government structure in Algeria is very complex. Despite all our efforts, new co-financing letters were not obtained, as per the GEF guidance.

In this regard, the GEF focal Point of Algeria met in person with the GEF Secretariat and the Agency (UNDP) to find a common solution. The discussions took place in Accra in October 2022.

It was agreed the following:

1. The letter from the parastatal company can not represent the Government. However, the letter can be accepted, but only for the company's contribution. To recall, that letter had three lines of co-financing: The Ministry of Environment (USD 15 million), the Ministry of Industry (USD 15 million) and the joint venture Divindus/SOPTE (USD 10 million). So this letter will be considered as a USD 10 million co-financing from Diindus/SOPTE.
2. The former letter from the Ministry of Environment will be resubmitted again. That letter was part of the first submission, but the GEF rightfully pointed out that, although there is an amount indicated, it was not clear enough about the timing and the nature of the co-financing. In order to simplify things, it was agreed that this letter could be reconsidered on an exceptional basis, as a USD 10 million in-kind co-financing from the Ministry of Environment.
3. The UNDP will revise the CEO Endorsement Request and submission package accordingly, with a total co-financing of USD 20,250,000.

The current submission contains 3 co-financing letters. To avoid confusion, they have been labelled 1; 2 and 3.

- ? Letter 1: UNDP, dated December 4th 2019 (\$250,000)
- ? Letter 2: Ministry of Environment, dated December 2nd 2019 (\$10m)
- ? Letter 3: SOPTE/DIVINDUS, Joint venture, dated January 27th 2021 (\$10m)

The new letters replace all previous ones, and should be used by the GEF Secretariat.

The agency thanks again the GEF Secretariat for the valuable discussions and for understanding the complexity in working in Algeria.

2/15/2022:

Thanks for this comment. In our response below we seek to respond to this comment, however we must state that the reality is that it is in general challenging to secure co-financing letters in Algeria. Please do recall that a similar GEF-5 project proposal (*GEF ID 5675 - Algeria: Integrated Municipal Management Model of Household and Similar Waste with Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions*) was unfortunately cancelled at CEO Endorsement stage due to the absence of proper co-financing letters. Although the Government of Algeria commits itself to supporting all donor-funded projects, it uses its own template and formatting, which donors often see as lacking strong commitment.

That said, for this particular project, a set of individual letters was first issued. They are consolidated into one file named *Old letters - Algeria AIM WELL project*. It is attached within this submission:

1. Letter 1 from the Ministry of Environment, dated 2 December 2019, stating a \$15 million co-financing.
2. Letter 2 from the Ministry of Industry, dated 26 November 2019, stating a \$15 million co-financing. Kindly note that the letter is signed by the Director-General of the para-statal company, with reference to a previous letter from the Ministry of Industry. The para-statal company can issue a letter on behalf of the Ministry, for projects it directly implements.
3. Letter 3 from the para-statal company, dated 6 December 2016, stating a \$10 million co-financing.

Very important to note that these letters are signed within different dates, and the Algerian currency (Algerian dinars) fluctuates a lot against the US dollar. Therefore, the ?Letter 2? and ?Letter 3? have almost the same Dinar value, but the second was signed in 2019, with an equivalent value of \$15 million; while the third was signed in 2016, with an equivalent value of \$10 million.

To avoid all these confusions and make things easy to understand, and following the first submission to the GEF, which asked for more explicit letters, the para-statal company (which is also the Responsible Party of this project) agreed to issue one joint letter in US dollar. As explained above, the company can do so, as a representative of the Government of Algeria and on behalf of Ministries, if the projects are under its prerogative. Therefore, please refer to the new letter, as below:

4. New letter, combining all co-financing commitments, and in US dollar. It indicates first, the letter from the UNDP, and second, the joint letter from the Government, stating \$15 million from the Ministry of Environment, \$15 million from the Ministry of Energy and \$10 million from the para-statal company Divindus/SOPTE. The letter clearly indicates that these are investments, and therefore, labelled as an equity investment in the co-financing table (please refer to the file *New letters - Algeria AIM WELL project*).

The new letters replace all previous ones, and should be used by the GEF Secretariat. The old letters are provided only for reference. The latest letter from the Government does refer to the previous letters, clearly states the type of co-financing, the amounts in USD, and the period (from 2021 to 2025). Of course, the letter was signed more than a year before, so the dates will be updated to meet the project implementation period.

Finally, the co-financing table is revised to reflect the indication from the letters. The previous split between in-kind and cash is replaced by a 100% equity investment.

1/26/2022:

UNDP is thanking the GEFSec, particularly the Project Manager of this project, for his availability and precious advice in order to find solutions and move forward.

First, it is true, the UNDP Algeria letter is good and follows what you asked. But this is internal to the Implementing Agency and easy to address. However, we cannot ask the Government of Algeria to use the same format. They have their own formats in terms of letters, and this is part of their sovereignty.

However, it is good to recall that the new co-financing letter results from previous individual letters. Stakeholders, including the Ministry of Environment, provided individual letters in 2019 during the PPG phase. However, the letters showed only amounts without specification (cash, etc.). After the first submission to GEF, the GEFSec requested to indicate such type of co-financing. Therefore, the stakeholders agreed to issue one aggregated letter, which is clear in terms of amounts and nature. The letter refers to previous individual letters, and indicates that the co-financing are investment (equity investments) for the waste to energy power plant.

An adjustment was made to the contribution from the Ministry of Environment, which provided \$15 million co-financing in total. This is split between 44% in-kind (\$6.6 million) and 56 % investment (\$8.3 million).

The entity that issued the combined letter did it on behalf of the Government. The Group Divendus is not an independent company, but related to the Ministry of Industry, which is part of the project and steering committee. The Group is the Responsible Party that will execute the project. It is a ?parastatal company?, having independent finance management, but with reporting line back to the Ministry. This is why it can issue letters on behalf of the Ministries.

To summarize, only two letters need to be considered by the GEF at this stage, the letter from UNDP, and the letter from Divendus, a parastatal company, that clarifies the co-financing amounts committed by the different line ministries.

Thank you for your understanding.

1/20/2022:

Comments have been addressed as per below.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please indicate the places where the targeted outputs 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 will be delivered.

For output 2.1, please elaborate the planned capacity building activities including the training approach (e.g. workshops) and the number of trainees.

For output 2.2, in addition to the development of legal and regulatory framework, please consider the development of long term policy and strategy for the whole country to upgrade the minimum standards and codes for organic farming and circular economy in managing solid wastes.

For output 2.6, please indicate the place where the organic waste transformation plant will be installed.

For output 3.2, please put more detailed information on the factory for the production of spare parts, including the place, the capacity of production, and the technology to be used.

Please use some GEF funding for this INV component; the GEF funding may be arranged from other components, for example, components 1.1-1.4

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

Thank you for these comments. In fact, most of the details exist and are in the UND Project Document (Prodoc). Following GEFSec recommendations, the CEO Endorsement Request (CEO ER) has been revised to include the most relevant details from the Prodoc. In this respect, the CEO ER has been updated with new paragraphs 9 to 50 that provide a detailed response to the GEF Secretariat comments above. The locations where investments will take place are made more detailed with explicit reference to the section on Project Maps and Geo-coordinates, as well as a reference to Annex E that has been updated with additional maps.

It is pointed out that the section on Expected Results that detail the project Component, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities need to be read together with the Project Results Framework that provides indicators and targets for the type of information requested by the GEF Secretariat. More specifically, the following summarise the response to GEF Secretariat queries:

- ? For Output 1.4 (at paragraph 26), the centralised waste sorting plant will be installed in the Ben Badis area of Constantine with the geo-spatial coordinates given in Annex E;
- ? For Output 1.5 (at paragraph 27), and as discussed in Table 4 in the CEO ER summarizing the changes brought to the project design, the collection points have already been installed in public places in Constantine and El Khroub, and the focus of this output will now be on operationalizing and optimizing the use of the collection points;
- ? For Output 1.6 (at paragraph 28), the two electric buses that will be financed by GEF investments will be used on collection routes in the two cities of Daksi Abdesalem and Zouaghi Slimane;
- ? On the issue of training for capacity building, it is pointed out that such activity is carried out under several project outputs, namely: (i) Output 1.1: By the end-of-project, a total of 5,600 households will be sensitized through awareness and education campaigns in the project area regarding circular waste economy and the roles and responsibilities of households (Indicator 4 in the Project Results Framework); (ii) Output 2.1: capacity building will be provided for the operation of analysis laboratory, and a total of 15 persons are expected to benefit (at paragraph 31); (iii) Output 2.6 and Output 2.8: a total of 55 persons (25 women)

will be trained for the operation of the waste processing plant (Indicator 9 in the Project Results Framework); (iv) Output 3.1 will provide technical training to a total of 350 persons (40% women) on circular waste management techniques (Indicator 11 in Project Results Framework);

- ? Regarding the suggestion to consider the development of long term policy and strategy for the whole country to upgrade the minimum standards and codes for organic farming and circular economy in managing solid wastes under Output 2.2, it is pointed out that same are covered explicitly under Output 2.3 that provides technical assistance for standardization for organic fertilizers together with homologation (protocols and procedures) for use in agriculture. The aspect of circular waste management is covered explicitly under Output 1.2 (at paragraph 24) when Master Plans (please see Indicator 5 in the Project Results Framework) for solid waste management for Constantine and Setif are developed. Then, this will be scaled up across all 48 Wilayas in Algeria ? i.e. nationally under Output 3.1 (at paragraph 39). This result is captured in the Project Results Framework under Indicator 10;
- ? For Output 2.6 (at paragraph 25), it is explicitly mentioned that the waste transformation plant will be co-located with the centralised waste sorting plant (Output 1.4) in the Ben Badis area;
- ? For Output 3.2: The DIVINDUS Group of industries already has a company dealing in metal works and manufacturing. Discussions with SOPTE has revealed that GEF investments would not be needed for this output, and would be better optimized for supporting activities under Outcomes 1 and 2.

Also, new annexes have been added in the CEO ER as follows:

- ? Annex H: Theory of Change Diagram (which underpins the Proposed alternative scenario)
- ? Annex I: GHG Emission Reductions Calculations (to accompany the text at paragraphs 51 and 52)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

The UNDP co-financing letter is super clear and excellent. But the others are missing or incorrect. Please ask other co-financers to use the format of the UNDP co-financing letter while providing the co-financing letters. These letters should show exact amounts and types of co-financing that are shown in the CEO ER package in Table C:

Ministry of Environment	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,666,667
-------------------------	---------	------------------------	-----------

DIVINDUS (SOPTE), AND and Canadian Partner	Equity Investment	Investment
Mobilized	33,333,333	

1/16/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

The new co-financing letters are missing in the resubmission package. Please upload the letters onto the GEF portal.

1/20/2022 MY:

Not at this time. Please see the comments in Box 1.

11/23/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

1/26/2022:

Please see response in Box 1. Letters are combined and can be found under the Roadmap (Documents) section.

1/20/2022:

The new co-financing letters were already uploaded to the GEF portal. Anyway, in order to make sure it is received by the GEF, it is included in this submission. Please find attached the original co-financing letter and its translation from French to English.

After discussions with the different project partners, it was agreed to follow the GEFSec recommendation and to provide a new and more explicit co-financing letter. To simplify the process, the partners also agreed to provide one single letter that summarizes all the expecting co-financings from the national partners. The new letter is part of this submission package. The co-financing amounts and tables are revised throughout the documents as below:

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Investment Mobilized	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment *	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,666,667
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment *	Equity Investment	Investment Mobilized	8,333,333
Recipient Government	Ministry of Industry	Equity Investment	Investment Mobilized	15,000,000
Private Sector	SOPTE	Equity Investment	Investment Mobilized	10,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	Investment Mobilized	250,000
Total Co-financing				40,250,000

* The Ministry of Environment provided \$15 million co-financing in total, split between 44% in-kind (\$6.6 million) and 56 % investment (\$8.3 million).

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

To be commented when the co-financing information is confirmed. See the comments in the previous box.

1/16/2022 MY:

Not completed at this time.

To be commented when the co-financing information is confirmed. See the comments in the previous box.

1/20/2022 MY:

Not at this time. Please see the comments in Box 1.

11/23/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

1/26/2022:

Please see response in Box 1

1/20/2022:

New co-financing letter is provided.

Please see new co-financing letters provided.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Yes. It is shown on page 33.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please use a table with three columns to show the changes from the PIF (before) to the CEO ER package (after), and justify the changes (why).

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

This suggestion has been fully incorporated in the updated CEO ER.

Table 4 has been introduced at new paragraph 18 to carry out the requested changes.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

In the CEO ER package, please elaborate how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are addressed. Updating the information from the PIF is necessary.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

This suggestion has been squarely integrated into the updated CEO ER at paragraphs 1 to 8 leveraging on information contained in the PIF and updated following updates during baseline review. This is complementary to the changes described above relating to Project Description Summary.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

In the CEO ER package, please elaborate how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived. Updating the information from the PIF is necessary.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The CEO ER is revised to include a new section on Baseline Scenario and Baseline Projects in paragraph 9. New Figure 1A has been added to illustrate the linear solid waste management model that exists in the baseline.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

In the CEO ER package, please elaborate how the alternative scenarios were derived. Updating the information from the PIF is necessary.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The CEO ER is revised to include a new section on Proposed Alternative Scenario at paragraphs 10 to 45. New Figure 1B has been added to illustrate the circular solid waste management model that the UNDP-GEF project will support to deliver multiple sustainable development dividends, including global environmental benefits as shown in Figure 2.

To better substantiate the project interventions, a detailed description of the underlying Theory of Change has been provided. The changes also cover a detailed description of the project outputs and activities.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

The project is aligned with CCM focal area.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

In the CEO ER package, please clearly elaborate incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing.

Updating the information from the PIF is necessary.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

Thank you for the suggestion. A new section on Incremental Reasoning has been added at paragraphs 46 to 48 of the CEO ER document. This is based on information provided at PIF stage but updated during PPG Stage with additional incremental changes that the GEF-funded project contributes towards, including post-COVID19 recovery by stimulating a local circular economy in solid waste management.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

In the CEO ER package, please clearly present the targeted global environment benefits, the supporting data, assumptions, methodology, and calculation for the benefits.

Updating the information from the PIF is necessary.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The global environment benefits that accrue from the project are reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The multiple ways in which emission reductions take place are illustrated in Figure 2 of the CEO ER (p. 69-74). The summary of direct and consequential emission reductions given in paragraphs 49 and 50 are now substantiated by Annex I that provides a detailed account of the methodologies, assumptions and data sets that have been used to calculate these reductions. The calculations cover each of the five ways in which the GEF-funded project will result in direct GHG emission reductions. Consequential emission reductions

using the top-down and bottom-up approaches have also been applied to estimate post-project global environmental benefits.

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

Not yet.

In the CEO ER package, please clearly elaborate how the project is innovative, sustainable and capable of scaling up.

Updating the information from the PIF is necessary.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

This suggestion has been fully taken into consideration, as reflected in new paragraphs 51 to 56 of the CEO ER. For these changes, information in the PIF has been updated.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

In Annex E, please mark the project boundary. Please clearly indicate if the project boundary is in any disputed territory of any neighboring countries.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

New paragraphs 57 and 58 have been added in the CEO ER (p. 24). These changes are accompanied by updated maps of project sites in Constantine and Setif (p. 60-61). Special

mention has been added to the effect that the project boundary is not in any disputed territory of any neighboring countries.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

In the CEO ER package, please:

1. provide a detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the PPG phase;
2. provide an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase;
3. elaborate which stakeholders will be engaged, the means of engagement, and the way of information dissemination.

Please do not expect readers to treat the UNDP project document as a must-read document. The CEO ER package should be the essential and comprehensive document at the GEF.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The point of the reviewer has been fully taken into consideration with the following changes made in the CEO ER to address the above concerns:

- 1. Annex J presents a detailed account of the stakeholders that have been engaged during the PPG stage, including a summary of the outcomes of the validation workshop;
- 2. Annex K provides the results of two field surveys that were carried out in Constantine and Setif, respectively, to inform the project design;
- 3. Table 5 has been added at paragraph 59 to list the ways in which different stakeholders identified during stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement will participate in project implementation, and monitoring and evaluation;
- 4. Annex L: Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been added in the CEO ER to detail the stakeholder analysis, and the means of engagement during implementation.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

In the GEF ER package, please use the necessary information in the UNDP Project Document to show the following:

1. Completion of the gender analysis.
2. Demonstration of the gender analysis in identifying any gender differences, gaps or opportunities that are linked to project/program objectives and activities
3. Illustration of any gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results from the project.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The above comments have been taken into consideration. Text related to Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan has been added at paragraphs 62 to 64 (p. 30-33). The Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (GAP) that was developed during project formulation at PPG stage is given in Annex M. It contains the following information:

- ? Gender analysis;
- ? Gaps and opportunities for a gender-differentiated approach to project design
- ? Table 7 in the CEO ER gives the Gender Action Plan (GAP) that provides gender-responsive project activities. Each activity is accompanied by gender-sensitive indicators and expected targets that are related to the Results Framework.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Yes. It is elaborated in paragraph 21 on page 16. However, the co-financing letter from the private sector is needed. See the comments in the Box above that is related to project co-financing.

1/16/2022 MY:

Not yet.

New co-financing letters are missing in the resubmission. Please resubmit them.

1/20/2022 MY:

Not at this time. Please see the comments in Box 1.

11/23/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

1/26/2022:

New co-financing letter is provided.

1/20/2022:

New co-financing letter is provided.

No Action needed. Please note that new letters of co-financing have been submitted.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

In the Risk section, please:

1. Please conduct an analysis of risk on project financing. If DIVINDUS (SOPTE), AND and Canadian Partner fail to co-finance the project, what will the government and the agency do?
2. Please undertake a detailed analysis on climate risk impact on this project.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The suggestions of the reviewer have been adopted. A detailed risk register has been formulated and is now provided in Annex N (p. 108-115). The risk register captures both the financial risk arising from lack of co-financing, as well as climate risk impact. The first has been rated as moderate risk, while the latter as low risk.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time. The document is not easy to be understood. Please spell out "SOPTE".

Please do not expect readers to read the UNDP Pro Doc as a necessary document. Please move all necessary information from UNDP Pro Doc to the GEF CEO RE package to demonstrate the following:

1. fully describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation;
2. elaborate on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area.

1/16/2022 MY:

Not yet.

Paragraphs 67 to 74 (p. 39-47) in the CEO ER doc do not show the relevant information.

1/20/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

1/20/2022:

Previous versions of the submission package included management arrangements with UNDP execution support services. All reference to execution service by UNDP has been removed from this project. Therefore, it is normal that the Management section (paragraphs from 66 to 74) no longer shows such information.

However, in order to be more explicit, the following text has been added in Paragraph 66.

The Project will be Full NIM (National Implementation), using the direct payment modality. UNDP will be providing direct payment services to the project.

Direct payment is a cash transfer modality not to be confused with UNDP support services to national implementation. In both cases, payments are made by UNDP from a UNDP bank account. But with direct payments, as stated in UNDP procedures, the Government assumes responsibility for the contracting process, performs recruitment or procurement, and signs the contract according to its own rules and regulations. The request for direct payment must be made through the approved FACE form, requesting UNDP to make payment directly to the vendor on behalf of the Partner. Complete vendor banking details approved by the Partner's authorized signatory should be attached to the FACE form.

This Financial Management of payments will basically include:

- Make direct payments to vendors,
- Establish checks,
- Create vendor profiles,
- Expenditure verification,
- Preparation of budget revisions

The changes requested by the reviewer have all been taken into consideration and addressed as follows:

- ? The acronym SOPTE (Société Polyvalente de Travaux et Environnement, that can be loosely translated as Polyvalent Company of Works and Environment) has been fully defined at the beginning of the CEO ER, and specifically at the beginning of paragraph 22;
- ? All relevant information regarding institutional arrangements has been moved from the ProDoc to the CEO ER. The new text is shown at paragraphs 67 to 74 (p. 39-47);

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

Please describe how the project is aligned with all relevant national strategies and plans, not only with the NDCs in the Paris Agreement, but also with others such as national policies and strategies on waste management, land use, and sustainable city development.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The GEF-financed project will squarely support implementation of government's new long-term strategy on solid waste management, especially regarding the institutionalization of a commercially-viable circular waste economy. This was discussed as part of the baseline analysis, but it has been reinforced in paragraph 78 as below.

77. The GEF Project is firmly rooted in the country's NDC. As articulated in its 2015 INDC, Algeria's mitigation strategy covers mainly energy, forests, housing, transport, industry and waste sectors. The paper also states that, by 2030, the country aspires to deploy biomass powered generators. Moreover, the government clearly states that it intends to give priority to the management of household solid waste. It is clear, therefore, that, at its core, this project covers a number of these objectives i.e. reduced transportation (including the of piloting, albeit at small scale, electric vehicles), biomass powered generators (from the organic fraction of the waste) and the management of household waste. The CO₂e emissions of Algeria has been estimated at 56,779 ktCO₂e. As part of its NDC, Algeria seeks to reduce its emissions by 22% by 2030. Based on these figures, the direct emissions reductions cited above represents approximately 7% of its climate change mitigation NDC. Importantly, the GEF-financed project will support the implementation of the National Strategy and Action Plan for Integrated Waste Management 2035 (SNGID 2035) that is expected to deliver the socioeconomic benefits given in Table 2. A main thrust of SNGID 2035 is to support commercially viable circular solid waste economy value chains, and the GEF-financed project will be a first of its kind in this respect

Finally, the project is also in line with the Second National communications (2010) to UNFCCC. It aims for sustainable and low carbon emission development, especially through circular economy.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

Please rewrite paragraph 30 with the following structure:

1. Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline;
2. Please explain how Knowledge Management will contribute to the project's overall impact.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

As suggested by the reviewer, paragraph 30 (in the original version) has been rewritten following the proposed. The Knowledge Management Approach is now detailed at paragraph 78, including a table with key deliverables, timeline and budget. It has been pointed out that Knowledge Management form an integral part of the Theory of Change that underpins the project design. The multiple ways in which Knowledge Management will contribute to the project's overall impact is given in paragraph 79.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Yes. It is attached as "Annex E" as an independent file to the GEF Portal. The whole document package is very confusing. For example, there are two "Annex E" for the project. One is showing Environmental and Social Safeguard, and another (**Annex E: Project Map(s) and Coordinates**) is attached within the GEF RE package. Please sort Annexes out and put them in one document for submission.

1/16/2022 MY:

OK.

Agency Response

The numbering of annexes has been sorted out. Please note that the confusion has arisen because both the CEO ER and the ProDoc have an Annex E. In the CEO ER, Annex E relates to Project Maps and Coordinates, whereas Annex E in the ProDoc relates to the Social and Environmental Safeguard. In order to avoid this confusion, the SESP has been added to the CEO ER as Annex O.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

Yes. It is shown on paragraph 31.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

It is stated on paragraphs 32 and 33; but please consider adding more local environment benefits such as cleaner air and water due to the project.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The points have been taken and these additional benefits have been included in paragraph 81.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not this time.

Please put all Annexes in one document and submit it one time, if they cannot be attached to the CEO RE package document.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

This has been done with Annexes H, J, K, and P submitted as separate documents in the CEO ER package document.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Yes. It is attached at Annex A in the CEO RE package.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

None from the PIF stage.

Agency Response

No Action needed.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not yet.

The US Council member asked several questions including the following two:

1. Does the GEF expect that the project might receive a Category A rating?
2. Page 32/44 ? what does ?roles specific to women will be created,? mean? It seems to imply certain work is more suited to women, is that what it is meant to imply? What does this mean in concrete terms?

It seems that Agency's responses to the above questions are not relevant. Please re-address them.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

The reviewer's comments have been duly taken into consideration, and the following responses have been made:

1. It is explicitly mentioned that the project is indeed Category A ? i.e. high risk project. The full response also provides details in terms of measures taken during the PPG to deal with the high risk inherent in the project. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that has been developed to guide the implementation of the high risk project is given in Annex P of the CEO ER.

2. The issue with ?roles specific to women? has been clarified. In fact, the wording used at PIF stage was misleading, and this has been corrected in the CEO ER. Rather, what is meant is that the project will adopt a gender-responsive approach by finding gaps and opportunities for women participation in the project. The gender-responsive approach is based on detailed Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan given in Annex M.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

One of the STAP comments states:

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

- What is the theory of change?

- What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?

- Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?

The Agency's responses are not satisfactory. Please use the information in the UNDP ProDoc to address the above issues in CEO RE package. Please do not expect readers to read the UNDP ProDoc while trying to understand the responses.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

These comments have now been addressed. The Theory of Change is discussed at paragraphs 11 to 16 (p. 8-10), and the ToC diagram is included as Annex H.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

It is reported in Annex C of the CEO RE package. It looks fine.

Agency Response

No action needed.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

In Annex E, please mark the project boundary. Please clearly indicate if the project boundary is in any disputed territory of the neighboring countries.

1/16/2022 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed.

Agency Response

Additional maps have been added in Annex E to show the project boundary.

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

12/15/2020 MY:

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

12/15/2020 MY:

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

1/16/2022 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

It seems that the outstanding issue of the project is co-financing. Please get new financing letters from the stakeholders without delay. Please read the comments above carefully and take actions to address them to avoid confusing readers. Thank you.

1/16/2022 MY:

Not yet.

New financing letters from the stakeholders are still missing. Please provide them. Please also address the remaining comments.

1/20/2022 MY:

Not at this time. Please see the comments in Box 1.

2/1/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

The Agency did not take any actions to address the comments on 1/28/2022 MY in Box 1. There has no additional document uploaded to the project document folder since 1/26/2022. Please address the comments and resubmit the CEO ER package.

2/18/2022 MY:

Not at this time.

Having consulted with his PPO colleagues regarding the co-financing letters, the PM list the following major issue to be cleared by the Agency:

As per the co-financing letters, it is not possible to understand and verify how the Government co-financing will materialize. There is no information in the letters to indicate if the co-financing is in-kind, public investment or investment mobilized. As per GEF co-financing guidelines (Please refer to the third screenshot below): *supporting evidence should include the type of co-financing provided?*. As such, the co-financing letters (except the UNDP one) are not acceptable. Please use the UNDP co-financing letter format to get new co-financing letters from other project co-financiers.

12/2/2022 MY:

Please address the following comments from the GEF PPO unit:

1. On core-indicators:

a. The target for the core indicator 6 in the core indicator table and annex A (results framework) does not match. Please correct the figure to reflect the actual target at the project completion.

b. Neither the M&E Plan, nor the Results Framework, describe the means of verification, sources, frequency of updates and responsible parties. Please include those in the template.

2. On gender:

a. Outputs 2.4, 2.6 and 2.8, as specified in the Gender Action Plan, aim at providing economic benefits (including jobs) to women. This category of gender-responsive measure that the project expects to address should be Yes (see green arrow in an email from the PM to Melissa Hernandez <melissa.hernandez@undp.org> of the UNDP New York Office at 4:53pm on 12/2/2022).

b. Please include under Outcome 4 Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation, plans for monitoring and evaluation of the Gender Action Plan.

3. The project results framework in Annex A is slightly off margins. Please make sure it fits within the margins. Same comment for part B of the ESS.

4. On the utilization of the PPG in Annex C: please include the difference between the budgeted amount and the amount spent to date in the amount committed (\$ 1,365). Please exclude any cents from the numbers and round up to the next dollar. Also the presentation of the status of PPG is per output (Preparatory Technical Studies, Formulation of UNDP-GEF Project Document) instead of per eligible expenditure as included in Guidelines ? please amend.

5. On the budget: The salary of the Project Coordinator and the project manager are being charged across components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing allocated to PMC is 1.0 million, and some co-financing is represented in grants. Please review and make changes accordingly. Please also include the responsible Entity in the right hand-side column.

For more detailed information on the comments, please read the email from the PM to Melissa Hernandez <melissa.hernandez@undp.org> of the UNDP New York office at 4:53pm on 12/2/2022.

1/30/2023 MY:

Not completed yet.

While most of the PPO's comments on December 1, 2022 were addressed, two comments remained unaddressed. Please continue addressing the following comments of the GEF PPO:

- Core Indicators: In respect to core indicator 6, the agency has not addressed the comment. The core indicator table indicates both direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions mitigated. In the annex A (results framework table) the agency has only reflected on partial direct GHG mitigated and the indirect GHG is also missing.

- Comment 4 was partially addressed. The table is still missing the difference between the budgeted and spent to date amount (difference = \$ 1,365). This number should be reflected in the column Amount committed.

2/3/2023 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and the project document was revised.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/15/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/20/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/28/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Objective: To promote an integrated and comprehensive solid waste management by fostering technology deployment, dissemination, and transfer in collaboration with private sector.

Rationale: Populations of Algeria's major cities have grown rapidly over the past decades. Local authorities have struggled to provide satisfactory services, particularly in waste management.

As of today, only about 6% of the recyclable waste is reused and recycled. The current circumstance has led to the oversaturation of existing landfills and the proliferation of illegal dump sites. As such, there are significant areas of concern, such as hygiene and public health issues, as well as the pollution of ground water and GHG emissions engendered by a deficient waste management system. This GEF project will help identify the barriers and root causes of unsustainability of waste management in the country and enlarge the share of reuse and recycle of wastes for the country, and therefore reduce GHG emissions.

The project consists of four components: (1) Integrated management of household waste at source; minimization of ultimate waste; reduced transport distance; (2) Value creation through

transformation of waste and poultry manure into fertilizer and energy; (3) Promotion of the municipal model of integrated waste management at the regional and national levels and (4) Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation.

Targeted global environment benefits are to reduce 34.4 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

Impact of COVID 19: Per the statistics of WHO, in Nigeria, from January 3, 2020 to November 23, 2022, there have been 266,283 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 3,155 deaths. As of 13 November 2022, a total of 91,552,088 vaccine doses have been administered. From February 2022 to November 23, 2022, very limited numbers of cases have been reported. As such, COVID-19 will not have significant impacts on the implementation of the GEF project.