

Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs to support the transition towards circular economy and create green jobs

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10456

Countries

South Africa

Project Name

Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs to support the transition towards circular economy and create green jobs

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

9/3/2021

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes. The changes on outcomes and outputs and justifications are provided under Part II of the CER document.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

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

Sep 2, 2021: Comments cleared.

July 19, 2021: The indicator 6 targets are the same as at the PFD. Please elaborate the rationale of the ratio of men and women on Indicator 11.

Agency Response Text has been added under the indicator table on page 5 to describe that the rationale for the ratio of men and women is based on the gender analysis carried out.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Sep 2, 2021: Comments cleared.

July 19, 2021: Please elaborate the nature of co-financing contributions that are not in-kind.

Agency Response A note has been added to para 197 detailing the nature of the main co-finance from TIA and IDC as funds mobilized in the form of grants and loans.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Sep 2, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 19, 2021: Please include the role of knowledge management in supporting sustainability and scaling up.

Agency Response A note on the role of knowledge management has been added to para 210 on supporting sustainability and to para 212 on supporting scaling up.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

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

Sep 27, 2021: Comment cleared.

Sep 13, 2021: Please see the comment in the last Box.

Yes, with Annex on stakeholder engagement plan.

Agency Response Paragraph 218, and Tables 11 & 12 added to further describe the Stakeholder Engagement Plan within the portal entry.

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

Yes with Annex on gender action plan.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Sep 2, 2021: Comments cleared.

July 19, 2021: The global PEE's support and its budget is not clear in terms of the necessity and the consistency with GEF's guidelines. UNIDO also cannot charge any costs except M&E. Please address these.

Also, please add coordination non-GEF initiatives and other global and national child projects of GCIP, as relevant.

Agency Response

- The global PEEs involvement in GCIP SA will be on a subcontracted basis to the national PEE. The specific potential services provided are detailed throughout the project description. A note is added to para 235.

-Only M&E is now charged to UNIDO other costs re-assigned to PEE

-Also, additional coordination with non-GEF and GCIP child projects has been added in para 245

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Sep 2, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 19, 2021: Please clarify if workshops and monitoring progress of result framework and gender indicators are envisaged while relevant budget is already incorporated in relevant budget lines (i.e. no additional cost).

Agency Response Monitoring of the results framework and gender indicators is included and budgeted within the project. It is included within para 269. It is envisaged that the regular progress monitoring against the results framework and gender indicators would include workshops as part of the PSC meetings to discuss the results, risks and way forward. A sentence has been added in para 262.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Sep 29, 2021: Comment cleared.

Sep 27, 2021: There is an issue on the discrepancies between the excel sheet and Annex on budget - project admin salaries are allocated to comp 2 on the excel sheet while ToR does not have such roles.

Sep 13, 2021: Comments cleared. On the budget, please see the comments in the last Box.

Yes. Please explain which document is the main ProDoc (as stipulated in GEF Policy) for this project other than annexes.

On budget table, please remove UNIDO's budget except MTR and TE and other parties? budget except executing entities.

Agency Response

-The main ProDoc refers to the project document itself, which is the CEO Endorsement Request document uploaded in the portal.

-Only M&E is now charged to UNIDO other costs re-assigned to PEE

- Other parties except the national executing entities have been removed from the budget table. The Budget table has been updated and re-uploaded

22 September 2021:

1. Implementation date changed to 01 January 2022

2. Budget has been amended and "slimmed down" to reflect outcome level figures and is a summary of the full project in one table. The full excel sheets are presented as an attachment.

The figures in Table B have been changed to reflect the same amounts as in the budget table and excel sheet in the documents tab.

The PMC staff draft TORs have been uploaded as attachments with reference to duties to be covered within the components, to justify the costs attributed to the component budgets for staff members. Furthermore, the salary totals for both staff members over 5 years will not be sufficiently covered by the project finance, therefore the co financing will in fact cover the deficit in the salary costs.

27 September 2021

New Excel table (Annex E - GCIP SA budget FINAL UPDATE 27092021) has been uploaded to reflect the salaries and outputs for the PMU staff that is in line with the uploaded TORs i.e. Project Technical Expert and Coordinator - Outcomes 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2, Project Administration Assistant - Outcome 3.1 only

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Sep 2, 2021: Please dismiss the previous comments.

July 19, 2021: Please explain the rationale of not having them. Also, please clarify if all knowledge products are included.

Agency Response Please elaborate on the above comment. Annex A, Project Results Framework is uploaded as an attachment and copied within the CEO document.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Sep 29, 2021: Comments cleared.

Sep 27, 2021: Comment 1 and 2 were addressed. Please address the budget issue above and make two budget tables consistent with ToR.

Sep 13, 2021: Please see the below comments from fiduciary and budgetary issues (responses can be made in the above boxes on 2 and 3).

1. Please amend expected Implementation Start and End dates taking into account the council review period.

2. On Stakeholder Engagement Plan: It only refers to ProDoc and Annexes ? please include information on the portal entry as well, which will allow the reader to understand what this plan entails.

3. Budget

3.1. Budget table in Annex E on the portal is not readable ? please include a readable budget (hint: presenting the budget per outcome instead of per outcome would make the table slimmer, so a bigger table would fit within the margins). Also, instead of

presenting 5 budget tables (year per year), please present a consolidated budget table only.

3.2 Also, while the budget table on the excel sheet has a consolidated budget table, there are two issues below. Please revise these to comply with the GEF guidelines (both on the portal and annex (excel sheet)).

The total budget appended to the Documents? tab for outcome 3.1 (\$87,613) is different than the amount in Table B in Portal (\$84,549). Same applies to Output 3.2: (\$102,500 in budget appended to the Documents? tab vs. \$105,564 in Table B in Portal).

The salaries and benefits for the Project Coordinator and the Project Administrator are partially charged to the project?s components and to PMC. Per Guidelines, project?s staff has to be charged to PMC (GEF and co-financing portion). Also, if this would not be possible, TORs showing the specific contribution to the project?s components are required ? no TOR?s for the above mentioned positions were found. Please note that 78% of the co-financing is represented in either loans or grants, and the allocated amount from co-financing to PMC is \$900,000 ? hence, there is room to cover the salaries and benefits for the Project Coordinator and the Project Administrator from PMC.

July 19, 2021: Not at this stage. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/19/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/13/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations