

Promoting eco-friendly crop protection solutions for persistent organic pollutant and highly hazardous pesticide reduction in Asia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10910

Countries

Regional (India, Philippines)

Project Name

Promoting eco-friendly crop protection solutions for persistent organic pollutant and highly hazardous pesticide reduction in Asia

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

3/31/2023

Review completed by PM

6/4/2023

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

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

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 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 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 Yes

Agency Response

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

Yes

Agency Response
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

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

Yes

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

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please see the following policy related comments that needs to be addressed.

1. On core indicators:

a. GEF Core Indicators are not mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A. please explicitly include the core indicators and their associate targets in the results framework.

b. At PIF for Core Indicator 11 the number was set at zero however at CEO endorsement the estimate is nearly 1.5 million direct beneficiaries. Please describe how the number was estimated. Please note that this indicator covers only Direct beneficiaries, not indirect ones, as per the definition available in pages 25-26 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01). Please exclude any indirect beneficiaries

2. On co-financing:

- The link for the co-financing letter for Fertilizer and Pesticide Authority seems to have been uploaded by error. Please remove the letter of support.

- The amounts, for the co-financing from JC dots Agri trading, in the letter of support are not consistent with the figures in the portal. Please revise them accordingly.

- The amounts, for the co-financing from Leganes Premier Land Corp, in the letter of support are not consistent with the figures in the portal. Please revise them accordingly.

- The amounts, for the co-financing from Taguibo Intefrated Farmers Association, in the letter of support are not consistent with the figures in the portal. Please revise them accordingly.

3. On the utilization of the PPG: there is a small error in the numbers as the budgeted amount (\$200,000) ? amount spent to date (\$133,905) = \$66,905 and not \$77,093. Also all numbers need to exclude decimals.

4. Gender mainstreaming plan table is off margins - please ensure that the auto-generated Portal view has this table within margins

5. Budget:

- It needs to be presented in a way that we can understand the details of all the activities funded through GEF resources. As an example, instead of having the description stipulated as ?contractual services ? companies? (for more than 3 million USD) we request the agency to provide details for each item line (which companies, for which services, etc). Same with the rests of activities. In that way one can assess the reasonability of charging the different activities / expenditures to the three identified sources (components, M&E, PMC). When resubmitted, we will be in a position to re-assess and provide comments if relevant.

- Responsible Entity column does not specify which executing partner is responsible of each budget line ? please amend.

June 4, 2023 - Some of the comments provided on May 13 were addressed, but others were not:

- Status of Project Preparation Grant: still the small error in the numbers persists - the budgeted amount (\$200,000) ? amount spent to date (\$133,905) = \$66,905 and not \$66,095. Please amend.

- Now that we received the budget table using the correct template, we can provide comments as follows:

o Project Management team (\$333,000) needs to be itemized. Also, Project Management Expert (\$169,400 + \$15,600) would presumably be part of the Project Management Team: as such, must be charged to the GEF and co-financing portions al located to PMC (2.87 million dollars were allocated from co-financing).

June, 23, 2023 - comments cleared

Agency Response

1. Core Indicators

a. The GEF Core Indicators and their associate targets (4.1, 9.1, 9.7 and 11) are explicitly mentioned in the TARGETS column of the Project Results Framework.

b. A re-evaluation of Core Indicator 11 was conducted to include only the direct beneficiaries of the project interventions in the demonstration sites - Regions 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11 in the Philippines and 10 states in India (Punjab, Uttrakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra. Madhya Pradesh) during the project lifetime was made. The proportion female/male in the agricultural sector is 22 females to 78 males for India while 23 females and 77 males for the Philippines is based on India Census Data and the Philippine Agricultural Data, respectively. On this basis, the number of direct beneficiaries of the project, assuming that the entire manufacturing of bio-pesticides will be absorbed by the market, would be 127,500, out of which 28,300 females and 99,200 males during the project lifetime.

2. Cofinancing

a. The attached cofinancing letter for the Fertilizer and Pesticide Authority was corrected.

b. The cofinancing figures for JC Dots Agri Trading, Leganes Premier Land Corp. and Taguibo Integrated Farmers Association were revised and corrected according to the amounts reflected in the cofinancing letters. As the cofinancing partners used different exchange rates, project proponents tried to harmonize the exchange rate in the submission which resulted to different figures compared with the letters submitted.

3. The PPG utilization Table (Annex C) was corrected.

4. Gender Mainstreaming Plan (Table 4) was reformatted to fit within the margins of the portal. General review of the formatting of the tables and figures in the portal was also undertaken.

5. The budget table was revised to include the details of the activities through budget notes. Identified project executing partners (HIL India and the Philippine Agriculture and Resource Research Foundation, Inc) will execute all activities except for the midterm review and independent final evaluation which UNIDO will undertake.

20 June 2023: UNIDO RESPONSE

The following are the responses of UNIDO on the comments made on 4 June 2023:

1. Status of Preparatory Grant:

The proponent has rechecked the values provided based on actual expenditures and the figures previously given were correct. The amount is USD 200,000 - USD132,905 expenditures = USD 67,095 as submitted. Please find below the summary of the PPG expenditures:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 200,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Meetings and workshops (inception meeting, focus group discussions, coordination meeting, consultative workshops, validation workshops)	50,000	38,423	11,577
Baseline data collection and analysis (visit to facilities, exchange visit, preliminary analysis and experts' mission)	70,000	54,470	15,530
Selection and assessment of PEEs	10,000	6,500	3,500
Preparation of environmental and social management framework, stakeholder engagement plan and gender study	30,000	14,894	15,106
Development of the logical framework and project document	40,000	18,618	21,382
Total	200,000	132,905	67,095

2. As this regional project involves two countries, there will be 1 project coordinator, 1 project assistant and 1 finance officer assigned to each of the country-level project management units. In addition, given the complexity of the project design, there is a need for project management experts (1 national expert for each country (USD 168,400) and 1 international expert to be shared by two countries (USD 15,600)). The project management experts will primarily support the monitoring function of the project team ensuring monitoring frameworks are drafted and implemented, indicators are monitored and reported, risks are addressed and project timeline is observed.

Given the in-kind nature of PMC co-financing, it is impossible to charge those positions to the co-financing portion of the PMC. It is, therefore, envisaged that the coordinators, assistants, finance officers and the experts will be financed through the GEF grant portion of the PMC.

The co-financing portion of the PMC is primarily sourced as contribution on office space, utilities and existing national staff time assigned to the project. The executing partners will

appoint staff to provide supervisory/advisory roles by virtue of special appointments and this forms part of their co-financing.

The project management team will be in-charge with the day-to-day project management and coordination. The PMC is budgeted as follows:

PMC Staff	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Total
2 Project coordinators	30000	30000	30000	30000	30000	150000
2 Project assistants	20000	20000	20000	20000	20000	100000
2 Finance Officers	16600	16600	16600	16600	16600	83000
Total PMC	66600	66600	66600	66600	66600	333000

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed and provided

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed and provided

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 Provided

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

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

May 22, 2023 - Please see the policy comments that needs to be addressed.

June 4, 2023 - Please see comments not adequately addressed and 2 that arise from the inserted budget.

June 23, 2023 - Comments addressed. Project recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/9/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/22/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/23/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations