

Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11169

Countries

Global (Cambodia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Mongolia, Pakistan, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago)

Project Name

Eliminating hazardous chemicals from supply chains

Agencies

UNEP, UNIDO, UNDP, FAO

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/17/2023

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however in the General Program Information table, the Anticipated Program Executing Entities are bundled in one line, which leads to a mistake in the Type (not all can be classified as ?others?) ? please fill out this information using individual rows so each executing entity can be correctly classified.

May 15, 2023 - Comment cleared, however the Program Commitment Deadline is incorrect. An 18-month deadline would be 12/30/2024 from Council meeting on 6/30/2023. Please amend.

May 17, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments All Executing Agencies have been added in separate lines, with their Type specified (both in portal and PFD package).

May 17, 2023 ? The Programme Commitment Deadline has been corrected.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

The summary concisely lays out the case case for the program and its transformational nature as well as the innovations it seeks to catalyze, as well as the geographical coverage, however please include in the summary the estimates of the GEBs for the program including the sub-indicators.

May 15, 2023 - There is a mismatch of the tons for CI 9 in the project summary with the core indicator table. Please address.

May 15, 2023 - Comment cleared

Agency's Comments Programme summary amended to reflect quantitative GEBs.

May 15, 2023: The core indicator table has been corrected into the portal to reflect the correct total program GEBs.

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes, the program objective is concise and measurable.

b) Yes, the program is structured with five main components. Each outcome will be achieved by outputs that are grouped by the kind of transformational impact they will deliver, i.e., whether they leverage finance, create coherent governance and policy, encourage innovation and learning, and/or create multi-stakeholder dialogues. The five substantive outcomes will be facilitated by two additional cross-cutting outcomes promoting knowledge management and monitoring & evaluation (M&E) coordinated by the global child project. The GEBs for the program are across several focal areas and proposes benefits for climate change, restoration, elimination of hazardous chemicals and waste and plastics. The theory of change is well defined and comprises an overarching ToC that weaves the two supply chains into a coherent and coordinated program supported by separate ToC's that presents the specifics of the separate supply chains,

c) The gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E are well articulated and included as well as appropriately budgeted. That being said, please provide a short elaboration on how gender will be addressed in particular include targeted interventions

to allow women to be beneficiaries of financial incentives (e.g., green credits, loans, etc.) that are part of the project.

For KM overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Program Description, however, there is no reference to an overall Communications Strategy/Plan for the Program. Please include a brief description of a coherent Communications Strategy/Plan for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects. This should also be properly budgeted into the Program.

For M&E, please ensure the M&E section includes relevant outcome indicators that allow to measure key aspects of the Program Objective statement. Currently, most indicators stay at output level. This is important for evaluability as the PFD will eventually be evaluated against its objective at completion.

The Agency may also consider adapting the objective statement further to ensure it matches what can actually be measured. As an example, the Agency may consider framing the statement around "To transition toward fashion and" rather than "To create" as it otherwise implies that the Program should measure the number of new supply chains created.

- d) The GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional are proportional.
- e) The PMC is within the 5% ceiling.

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared expect, on the program objective: The Program objective is specific about "To create", but the two "objective" indicators now listed in the latest version of the M&E section are about creating and transforming, so the program objective should also reflect the "transforming" part in its statement. This could take the form of: "To support the establishment and the transition to".

May 17, 2023 - Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

- a) Additional funds allocated to Component 6 on KM and a description of a program-wide Communications Strategy added in the section on Innovation & Transformation.
- b) The objective statement and related indicators have been further refined and addressed in the M&E section. These will continue to be refined during the PPG. Please note outcome indicators will be developed during PPG to relate to the 6 Programme Components.
- c) The Gender and Vulnerable Groups Analysis (Appendix 1) has been updated with more targeted interventions in Table 2. A paragraph describing the gender interventions, in particular targeted interventions to allow women to be beneficiaries of financial incentives

(e.g., green credits, loans, etc.), has been added under program components section in the PFD.

17 May, 2023 ? Program objective and indicators are updated. The program objective now reflects the indicators.

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?

b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGL, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. The program is built on existing work including GEF funded projects on textiles and fashion and leverages several platforms and proposes innovative and disruptive pathways to achieve transformation in the supply chains being addressed by the IP. There is also a well thought out stakeholder and private sector engagement plan which will be further refined and elaborated during the PPG.

Please see some suggestions for strengthening the description:

- Technological barriers: Another technological barrier besides storage is the mixing and coating of materials rendering them non-recyclable

- Under political or social drivers: the lack of more systemic adoption of labor safety standards and lack of a drive for some adequate wage in the industry by major brands (in lieu of the obvious lack of national laws, regulations and enforcement in producer countries) seems another driver to enable cheap, fast fashion

- Component 1: Corporate sustainability reporting (within paragraph on promoting learning and innovation) is also a lever for finance from institutional investors at least for big brands
- Component 2: Sustainable sourcing: (i) here traceability and corporate reporting on the materials footprint is another challenge and needs drastic improvement. (ii) Localizing supply chains with using natural fibers has many positive aspects that you outline, but it assumes that these natural fibers are sustainably produced which is obviously not a given (e.g. just take cotton farming). This is addressed in component 3 but merits mentioning here.
- Component 4: Can we include youth in addition to women stronger here. Young people drive fashion and design even and future demand and are a key target to involve in consumer facing campaigns.
- Component 5: is it worth to highlight that the major emphasis is the recycle and reuse of materials versus simply 'downcycling' materials (e.g. crushing construction materials as input to paving or other filling purposes; same with textiles -shredding isn't the desired solution)

May 16, 2023 - Comment cleared

Agency's Comments The PFD section on Key Systems Drivers and the theory of change have been amended to address the suggestions made, which are welcomed by the IP Lead Agency. Text was also updated in the Programme Component descriptions, including examples from child projects (e.g. on traceability in Programme Component 2).

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments Yes. The theory of change is well presented and clear and includes the transformation levers to be addressed and describes how each component does so including through innovation, finance and policy coherence. There is a good treatment of gender as well as knowledge and communications except for the additions requested in the 3 above.

Agency's Comments

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments The program is coherently presented and credibly brings together two different value chains into a seamless intervention that focusses on enabling new materials, design for sustainability and access to finance within an enabling policy

environment. The countries in the program represent a diverse set of issues along the value chains of both sectors and lend themselves to supporting the transformation proposed and are well aligned with the global to local rationale of the program. GEF finances are seen as a catalyst to unlock additional resources and activate other stakeholders along the supply chain which will enable the achievement of the program's objectives. The program fully integrates several environmental dimensions of each supply chain.

Agency's Comments

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

- a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**
- b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

Secretariat's Comments There is an overall execution and organizational structure as well as a good description how the governance structure works with and convenes other stakeholders to amplify impact. It is noted that the executing agency for the coordination will need to be confirmed during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

- a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**
- b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**
- c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**
- d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?**

Secretariat's Comments

The program proposes four core indicators which highlights the integrated nature of the program. It additionally has significant targets on several sub-indicators on plastics and tons of waste. The socioeconomic benefits are well described as well as the framework for measuring the results planned. That being said the GEBs are well below the level of ambition articulated by the program and these need to be strengthened in the revision of this program to identify and measure results that the program catalyzes as well as influences through changes made at the points to and from the interventions points of the projects at country level.

For CI 6 please see the following comments:

1. At PDF level the total amount of GHG avoided/mitigated is 3,383,884 tCO₂ (56%), most of them under sub-indicator 6.2 non-AFOLU sectors. When looking into the national child projects separately, the total amount is slightly higher, i.e. 3,427,884 MtCO₂.
2. As per the PFD, only indirect emissions are accounted. However, this is not clear from the reading of the child concept notes, and it seems most of the emission reductions shall be labelled as direct instead.
3. As per the reading of the child concept notes, most of the emissions reductions are coming from energy savings due to improved practices.
4. The estimated GEF\$/t is 15.9 as per the current 56% scenario, which is way above from the 9.5 estimated from the GEF-7 portfolio. The difference is because the PFD is only claiming 56% of the estimated GHG mitigated under the project. However, there seems to be ways for improvement in how to estimate the GHG mitigated to help meet the expected emissions reductions of 6,000,000 tCO₂ (see below).
5. All 8 child concept notes are claiming GHG reductions. Except for two projects (India - 6 years and Ecuador - 5 years), the remaining don't provide a timeline for the GHG mitigated. Actually, by reading the concept notes it seems some countries may be reporting on GHG mitigated annually (i.e. Mongolia and Peru?), which will yield a much lower number of emission reductions achieved. Please check with the child projects to ensure they are all reporting GHG consistently for the same period of time? This would help reach the CI6 figure initially envisioned for this IP.
6. As for Cambodia, there are some inconsistencies in CI6 across the concept note. Similarly, India reports 60,00 indirect tCO₂e. I assume they meant 60,000 tCO₂ but worth checking and update accordingly.
7. Overall, at child project stage we need to ensure consistency in the way the GHG reductions are calculated and for how long the GHG reductions are claimed.

While NOT a GEF tracked indicator the corporate sustainability reporting in both supply chains could (and to my mind should) not only trace energy use/avoided GHG emissions, chemicals use etc. but at least AIM to trace and report on water intensity of each of the supply chains in the child projects. One would expect to see a decrease over time but if not monitored this will remain anecdotal.

Mention applicable GBF targets to track to be able to assess co-benefits (even if not setting a target; same as above for water tracking will aid to report co-benefits at the end).

The PFD notes that the program will generate the following global environmental benefits (GEBs):

- Core Indicator 9: chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced;
- Core Indicator 10: reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources;
- Core Indicator 4: ha of land and ecosystems under restoration, (please note that core indicator 3 is for restoration, not 4 but the data is entered in CI 4) and;
- Core Indicator 6: GHG emissions mitigated.

The evidence for significant contributions on CI 3 or CI 4 is lacking based on the approach identified in the PFD and the specifics of the identified child projects that will contribute to this indicator.

The explanation provided needs to clarify how the changed practices will result in a benefit to globally significant biodiversity: Core Indicator 4.

The PFD notes that ?Hectares are calculated by child projects as the percentage of land currently under unsustainable practices, which will switch to sustainable practices. For example, the Cambodia child project aims to bring 20% of construction and 40% of sand mining areas under improved practices, as well as an additional 4200 ha due to the reduction of firewood use; the Ecuador child project targets an estimated 12% of crops used for fashion or construction; the Mongolia child project targets 10% of goats grazing practices in the selected area; and the Pakistan child project aims to apply sustainable agriculture practices to a third of the banana production area in Sindh (potentially from reduced tillage, enhanced soil carbon-input and eliminated biomass burning).?

There is no indication that the areas that will benefit from the changed practices are globally significant from a biodiversity perspective, and this is unlikely given what is occurring already in these landscapes. The proponents should clearly make the case that the indicator is justified from a biodiversity perspective.

The PFD notes that during consultations, ?the following initial indicators were proposed, broadly following the transformation levers that are at the base of the IP theory of change.?

With regards to linking up to the GBF targets, the policy coherence indicator and the finance indicator is something that can match up to the GBF targets:

1. Leveraging finance:

- a. Amount of resources unlocked for sustainable supply chains or financial flows influenced (may include national investments, CEO investments, banks investment amounts)
- b. Number of finance mechanisms developed or adapted (mechanisms targeted by the projects may include EPR, loans/ lending criteria, procurement, subsidies and incentives)

3. Policy coherence:

- a. Policy alignments by different ministries and with non-state actors ? finding and eliminating contradictory policy instruments or perverse outcomes (e.g. building codes, subsidies and tax (dis)incentives, trade agreements)

Given the viable core indicators identified, and the program level indicators currently under consideration, we believe that the IP and the child projects will make contributions to GBF targets 7, 15, 18, and 19. Targets 15, 18, and 19 relate to policy coherence and finance which are also being tracked by the program level indicators. Target 7 is best tracked by CI 9.

Therefore, please revise the PDF content to reflect this contribution to the GBF targets. Also, the global coordination grant/platform should set up a monitoring mechanism that will track the contributions of the individual child projects to these targets as identified in each individual project logframe.

May 15, 2023 - Comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

Comments 1-6 have been addressed through a comprehensive review of the GEBs in each child project and summarized in the PFD. A number of changes were made covering the received comments. Some updates in the calculations are described in the GEB methodology in the PFD.

See earlier response on the program level objective indicators (Question 3 above)

Comment 7 addressed via the integration of GBF targets 7, 15, 18 and 19 in the PFD and Global child project.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?**

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

All risks have been sufficiently described and appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed, however for Climate Risks: please also include increase in frequency and severity of droughts and heatwaves ? both of relevance to the sectors.

May 15, 2023 - Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Increase in frequency in droughts and heatwaves has been added in the risk table in the PFD.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes. The program is fully aligned with the IP goals of policy coherence and green by design.

Agency's Comments

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes. The program presents a table showing alignment with NIPs, NAPs, NDCs and the relevant goals of the GBF.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Please note the earlier comments on KM, M&E and Gender - please elaborate in the relevant section of the portal submission.

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however please note previous comment on KM.

May 15, 2023 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Please double check calculations in the portal.

May 16, 2023 - for the India child project financing table please remove the numbers after the decimals. This will mean the numbers will be rounded down, however it creates an error on the overall finance for the work program in total. Please amend and resubmit.

May 18, 2023 - The numbers after the decimals in the India child project have been corrected as per the request of PPO. We note that implementing the changes of \$0.5 across the PFD required updating 10 tables, recreating the PFD, updating the portal and filling the review sheet. This comment is cleared.

Agency's Comments The finance tables have been reviewed and all tables validated.

May 16, 2023 ? The proposed approach for the India financing table to remove decimals and round the numbers down was not applied as the resulting financing table did not comply with the exact 3:1 CC STAR:CC incentive ratio needed to allow the program to be submitted in the portal.

An alternative approach was applied where the India child project financing was adjusted to not contain any decimals while complying with the needed exact 3:1 CC STAR:CC incentive ratio. This resulted in a reduced overall India and program budget (exactly 4 USD less).

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, however two letters are missing. Please provide the letters for India and Ecuador.

May 15, 2023 - Comment cleared, however please make the following edits:

Costa Rica's LOE indicates different project title and executing partner than in Portal - please include in Portal the info that is in LoE.

Trinidad and Tobago's LoE has different project title from Portal - please include in Portal the info that is in LoE.

May 17, 2023 - comments cleared.

Agency's Comments Letters from India and Ecuador have been uploaded in the Portal.

17 May, 2023

Re Costa Rica: The project title has been updated to match the LoE. However, ?in Costa Rica? has been added to avoid confusion with the overall program title. The executing partners have been updated according to the LoE. This was confirmed by UNIDO.

Re Trinidad and Tobago: The project title has been updated according to the LoE. However, also here ?in Trinidad and Tobago? has been added to avoid confusion with the overall program title.

Compilation of Letters of Endorsement Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Please see the comments in the review.

May 15, 2023 - Please address the mismatch with the core indicators.

May 17, 2023 - for the India child project financing table please remove the numbers after the decimals. This will mean the numbers will be rounded down, however it creates an error on the overall finance for the work program in total. Please amend and resubmit.

May 18, 2023 - Final comment is addressed and the PFD is recommended for clearance.

Agency's Comments **May 15, 2023**: Mismatch with core indicators addressed in portal. The portal now matches the PFD.

May 16, 2023 ? The proposed approach for the India financing table to remove decimals and round the numbers down was not applied as the resulting financing table did not comply with the exact 3:1 CC STAR:CC incentive ratio needed to allow the program to be submitted in the portal.

An alternative approach was applied where the India child project financing was adjusted to not contain any decimals while complying with the needed exact 3:1 CC STAR:CC incentive ratio. This resulted in a reduced overall India and program budget (exactly 4 USD less).

May 17, 2023

Comments addressed.

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

1. Clear justification of the contributions to all the core indicators being targeted by the projects.
2. For the core indicators 4 and 6 - for each child project the respective agencies should validate the numbers and for core indicator 9 for Ecuador, Peru and Mongolia the POP type needs to be identified by the time of CEO endorsement.
3. For Mongolia, please submit a revised LoE that indicates the source of funds prior to or during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments Please see response to Question 5.4 above.

I. Noted

2. Noted. The POPs type has been added for core indicator 9 for Ecuador, Peru and Mongolia. Please note that when working on the child project indicators in the portal, the names of the child projects on top of the page kept changing - showing wrong project names
3. Noted.

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/20/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2023	