

Green Production and Sustainable Development in Secondary Aluminum, Lead, Zinc and Lithium Sectors in China

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10673

Countries

China

Project Name

Green Production and Sustainable Development in Secondary Aluminum, Lead, Zinc and Lithium Sectors in China

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/9/2021

Review completed by PM

3/7/2022

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, the emissions of POPs from the secondary non-ferrous metals production sector is a priority sector for the Stockholm Convention and is therefore aligned with the CW focal area.

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 project is aligned with the proposal at PIF with some justified modifications due to work done during the PPG.

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

Co-financing has been confirmed and letters uploaded, however please add if the Ministry of Ecology and Environment amount of 250,000 is Investment mobilised or recurrent expenditure.

Jan 19, 2022 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

The co-financing amount of 250,000 is investment mobilized.

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 The core indicator estimates have been increased from the PIF to the CEO endorsement.

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, the baseline and associated projects are well elaborated.

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, the alternative scenario is well articulated and logically described.

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

Provided

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

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

The project has a well described stakeholder engagement plan and a clear account of how stakeholders were engaged throughout the preparation phase of the project.

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

A well articulated gender analysis and engagement plan has been summarised and provided.

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

This is well elaborated and described.

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

All risks including those posed by Covid-19 and climate change have been identified and appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed.

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

The project is aligned with China's commitments under the Stockholm Convention to reduce emissions of POPs from point sources including the secondary production of non-ferrous metals.

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. The project also builds on lessons learned for a previous project in China that focussed on the secondary production of copper.

Agency Response

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

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

All annexes including the UNDP checklist have been provided.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The PRF has been provided and is clear.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. Core Indicators:

(i) For GEF Core Indicators 6 and 10 - please include CEO Endorsement level targets in the Results Framework in Annex A, aligned with those targets found in Core Indicator Table. GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.

(ii) For GEF Core Indicator 9 ? please double check the target provided in the core indicator with the value provided in the Results Framework. They don?t seem to be aligned.

2. Under ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG), it looks the Risks assessment table was mistakenly included instead of the usual PPG expenditure report table ? please provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status as requested in this section.

3. Budget table was included under Annex E but not uploaded in Portal under the Document section. Also the pdf version of the CER ER presents a budget table that is nor readable, please amend.

4. Budget Table: as part of the project?s staff, after reading the TORs in Annex 7 of the ProDoc, there are two positions that overlap: Project Coordinator and Project Manager. While the Project Manager is fully charged to PMC, the Project Coordinator is fully charged to the project?s 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. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC (at least partially in this case) is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. That said, when the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds, which for this projects is not the case), the project?s staff could be charged to the project?s components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique

outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 5.35 million, and out of 110 million of co-financing, 65.7 million (60%) is represented in in grants. Please amend.

April 21, 2022 - comments cleared.

Agency Response

On 5 April, 2022

1. Core Indicators:
 - (i) GEF Core Indicator 6, CO2 emission reduction of 52,278.6 t/a has been added to Annex A, Project Results Framework. GEF Core Indicator 10, Indicator 10.2, 1-2 emission control technologies each will be implemented in the SAI and San sectors as reflected in Indicators 9 and 10.
 - (ii) For GEF Core Indicator 9, emission reduction for the two-year operation period were originally listed separately for the BAT/BEP demonstration and NRP. The total emission reduction is now reflected as a total amount of 354.75 g TEQ for the two-year operation period, as reflected in the Annex of the GEF Core Indicator.
2. The correct Annex C has been uploaded to the Portal.
3. Budget tables had been properly corrected for a clear submission.
4. Kindly note that the roles of experts under Technical Components are to lead the delivery of high level technical support (incremental support delivered by the GEF) to main components of the project, and these posts will not be involved in project management activities under the PMC.
Thus, the title of these positions was changed to ?Technical Coordinator? and their TORs (Annex 7) had been revised accordingly to avoid any perception of overlap. It is confirmed that the Project Manager TOR remains the same and is placed under the PMC. The Project Manager will thus coordinate the work of the Technical Coordinators and will be responsible for the overall management and monitoring of the whole Project as to achieve its intended objective as established in the referred Guidelines.
Please note the Budget Table (Annex 1 ? TBWP) was also duly updated on Budget Notes 4, 10 and 20

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Council comments have not been responded to. Please provide in the main portal document.

Jan 19, 2022 - Comment not addressed. Please provide responses in tabular form in the portal template.

March 7, 2022 - Comment addressed.

Agency Response

On 21 Jan, 2022

Council Members comments and detailed responses had been included in the GEF Portal, in addition to Annex B od CEO ER Document.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

STAP comments have not been addressed. Please provide in the main portal document.

Jan 19, 2022 - Comment not addressed. Please provide responses in tabular form in the portal template.

March 7, 2022 - Comment addressed

Agency Response

On 21 Jan, 2022

Council Members comments and detailed responses had been included in the GEF Portal, in addition to Annex B od CEO ER Document.

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

Please respond to the comments in the review sheet.

Jan 19, 2022 - Please respond to the comments on comments from the GEF council members and the STAP.

March 7, 2022 - Comments have been addressed and the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

April 21, 2022 - additional comments from PPO have been addressed and the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/7/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations