



Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)

Project Title:	Greening Industry Through Low Carbon Technology Applications for SMEs
GEF ID:	5725
UNIDO ID:	130279
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-5
Country(ies):	Thailand
Region:	SA - Southeast Asia
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs¹:	NA
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Stand-alone
Implementing Department/Division:	ENE / ETI
Co-Implementing Agency:	NA
Executing Agency(ies):	Department of Industrial Works (DW), Department of Industrial Promotion (DIP), Ministry of Industry (MOI)
Project Type:	Medium-Sized Project (MSP)
Project Duration:	42 Months
Extension(s):	2
GEF Project Financing:	USD 1,880,000
Agency Fee:	USD 178,600
Co-financing Amount:	USD 9,510,000
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	9/6/2016 <i>Insert the date as per letter from GEF CEO</i>
UNIDO Approval Date:	10/19/2016 <i>Insert EB approval date of the project</i>
Actual Implementation Start:	12/5/2016 <i>Insert the PAD issuance date of the project</i>
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:	US\$ 786,405.25
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	NA <i>IF applicable, insert expected/actual date of MTR submission to the GEF.</i>
Original Project Completion Date:	12/31/2020

¹ Only for GEF-6 projects, if applicable

	<i>Insert the indicated project completion date as per CEO Approval / Endorsement document.</i>
Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:	12/31/2021 <i>Insert the project completion date as reported in the previous PIR for Fiscal Year 2021 (FY21)</i>
Current SAP Completion Date:	6/30/2023 <i>Insert the project completion date as currently seen in the system</i>
Expected Project Completion Date:	6/30/2024 <i>If the date is the same as above, please confirm; if you plan to extend the project completion date, please indicate here and elaborate further under section III.2</i>
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	1/31/2024 <i>Insert expected/actual date of TE submission to the GEF</i>
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/30/2024 <i>Insert a date <u>no later than</u> 12 months after the TE submission date</i>
UNIDO Project Manager²:	Sanjaya Shrestha

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective		
<p>To promote and support adoption of energy efficient practices and technologies in selected Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Thailand for improved competitiveness and greening of industry. The project is designed around two substantive components and aims to create demand for low-carbon technologies through policy support, awareness raising activities and capacity building of government, financial institutions industries, technical personnel, as well as the implementation of demonstration projects to encourage the adoption of such technologies in SMEs. These interventions will create an environment conducive to increased investment in low carbon technologies and energy efficiency improvements by SMEs in Thailand.</p>		
<i>Project Core Indicators</i>		<i>Expected at Endorsement/Approval stage</i>
1	Direct electricity and fuel savings over project implementation time.	Annual direct energy savings (in last year of the project): 845,065 GJ
2	Direct GHG emissions mitigated (tCO ₂) over project implementation time.	Annual direct GHG emission savings (in last year of the project): 76,317 tCO ₂ eq

Baseline
<p>Until now, a targeted approach to catalyze investment in low-carbon technologies at the SME level has not been implemented. While a number of initiatives to promote energy efficiency and foster the adoption of efficient technologies in SMEs exist in Thailand, a lack of awareness and capacity prevents the initiatives from having wide reaching and sustainable impact in the country. Due to COVID19 pandemic in Thailand. Many of target SMEs were impacted. They postpone LCT investment and focus on marketing and pandemic protection.</p>

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY22. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY22.

² Person responsible for report content

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management³, Agencies are expected to closely monitor changes that occur from year to year and demonstrate that they are not simply implementing plans but modifying them in response to developments and circumstances or understanding. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY21, in the last column.

Overall Ratings ⁴	FY22	FY21
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<i>Using the progress rationale reported in section II, please briefly justify the selected FY22 GEOs/DOs ratings versus the GEOs/DOs ratings reported in FY21.</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>
<p><i>Using the progress rationale reported in section II, please briefly justify the selected FY22 IP ratings versus the IP ratings reported in FY21.</i></p> <p>The project implementation progress is affected due to ongoing Covid19 crisis and also the changes in the project structure. The Ministry of Industry (MOI) gave the project execution responsibilities to Department of Industrial Works (DIW), as in the challenging time the original executing agency Department of Industrial Promotion (DIP) has bigger objective to achieve that is revival of MSM sector and overall investment sentiments in the country.</p>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<i>Using the progress rationale reported in section II and III, please briefly justify the selected FY22 risk rating versus the risk ratings reported in FY21.</i>		

II. Targeted results and progress to-date

Please describe the progress made in achieving the outputs against key performance indicator's targets in the project's **M&E Plan/Log-Frame at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval**. Please expand the table as needed.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to any supporting documents that may be submitted as annexes to this report.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Baseline	Target level	Progress in FY22
------------------	-----------------	----------	--------------	------------------

³ Adaptive management in the context of an intentional approach to decision-making and adjustments in response to new available information, evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation or research, and experience acquired from implementation, to ensure that the goals of the activity are being reached efficiently

⁴ Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and assure that the indicated ratings correspond to the narrative of the report

Component 1 – Policy analysis and improvement for the promotion of LCTs within Thai SMEs				
Outcome 1.1: Improved understanding and awareness of existing policy gaps and enabling policies support the improvement of existing policy framework				
Output 1.1.1: Policy Gap and Barrier Analysis conducted, and key policy recommendations proposed to Thai policy-makers	Number of analytical studies of the existing policy framework completed. Gender dimensions included in the policy review and formulation. (y/n)		0	1 policy gap and barrier analysis completed and shared with stakeholders.
Output 1.1.2: Awareness campaign on promoting LCTs for SMEs conducted	Number of participants attending the project organized awareness raising events (disaggregated by gender).		0	600 local experts, industry personnel, local equipment and service providers, and government representatives (at least 10% women) attend awareness raising events.
Output 1.1.3: Financing schemes for the adoption of LCTs by SMEs facilitated and promoted	Number of “reader-friendly” packages provided to SMEs on available financing schemes. Gender dimensions included in the package. (y/n)		0	1 “reader-friendly” package provided to SMEs on available financing schemes (via workshops/ trainings and the Information and Learning Platform), (including gender dimensions, where relevant).
	Number of consultation workshops held for government counterparts.		0	2 consultation workshops held for government counterparts.
Component 2 – Capacity building and implementation of LCTs in SMEs				
Outcome 2.1: Improved capacity and knowledge management supports the improvement of energy efficiency in SMEs				
Output 2.1.1: Technical capacity building on low-carbon technologies and EnMS of local technical experts, equipment and service providers, financial/banking institutions and industry.	Number of local technical experts and equipment/ service providers attending technical training.		0	50 local technical experts and equipment/ service providers (at least 10% women) attend the technical training.
	Number of industry representatives attending the 2-day User training (disaggregated by gender).		0	300 industry representatives (at least 10% women) attend the 2-day User training.
Output 2.1.2: An Information and Learning Platform (I&LP) on LCTs	Number of I&LPs on low-carbon		0	1 I&LP on low-carbon

established and dissemination materials developed	technologies operational.		technologies operational.	
Outcome 2.2: Increased competitiveness of selected SMEs as a result of increased adoption of LCTs and improved operating practices				
Output 2.2.1: Implementation of LCTs in SMEs	Number of low-carbon technology/ EnMS projects implemented by SMEs with support from the project.	0	At least 30 low-carbon technologies / EnMS projects implemented by SMEs with support from the project.	
Component 3: Monitoring and Evaluation				
Outcome 3.1: Effectiveness of the outputs assessed, corrective actions taken and experience documented				
Output 3.1.1 Project and its activities monitored and evaluated on a regular basis in line with GEF, UNIDO, and government requirements.	* Direct energy saving: Annual savings of 504,460 GJ at the end of the project; * Direct GHG reductions: 56,692 tonnes of CO2eq per year at the end of the project.	0		
Output 3.1.2 Terminal Evaluation Report completed.		0		

III. Project Risk Management

1. Please indicate the overall project-level risks and the related risk management measures: (i) as identified in the CEO Endorsement document, and (ii) progress to-date. Please expand the table as needed.

Describe in tabular form the risks observed and priority mitigation activities undertaken during the reporting period in line with the project document. Note that risks, risk level and mitigations measures should be consistent with the ones identified in the CEO Endorsement/Approval document. Please also consider the project's ability to adopt the adaptive management approach in remediating any of the risks that had been sub-optimally rated (H. S) in the previous reporting cycle.

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 21	(i) Risk level FY 22	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk ⁵
1	Policy and institutional risk: Change in national priorities lead to delays and reductions in the effectiveness of delivery of the project outputs.	Modest risk (M)	Modest risk (M)	The Department of Industrial Promotion (DIP) of the Ministry of Industry is the National Executing Agency and has been a close partner of UNIDO on a number of ongoing projects in Thailand. DIP has been closely involved in the development of the project, throughout the PPG phase, and therefore, has a strong ownership of the project, which is closely in line with the mandate. Furthermore, industrial energy	There are some issues that have surfaced due to the problems on the recruitment of the National Project Coordinator with the DIP for the last 10 months which is still under the discussions.	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁵ New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.

				efficiency and energy issues have been a key objective and strategy of the Thai government in recent years, and therefore no change in this focus is expected.		
2	Technical risks: Associated with upgrading/ installing of energy efficient technologies.	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	UNIDO will employ the services of highly skilled experts with specific expertise in energy efficiency and proven training skills from other countries to ensure that high quality and comprehensive trainings serve to mitigate this risk. While low-carbon technologies are relatively new to the Thai SME sector, they are considered proven and widely available technologies, and as such, no technical risk is expected.	Experts certified by the comprehensive trainings by the IEE project have been connected with PMU. We also use new experts from DIP recommendation to reduce our technical risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Financial risk: Delay in financing of technology investment projects.	Modest risk (M)	Modest risk (M)	As energy efficiency improvements in SMEs are often no- to low-cost, access to external financing is not expected to be a crucial factor for many of the improvement projects. If, however, external financing is required, close engagement with financial institutions and enterprises, as well as capacity building on the development of bankable investment projects, will mitigate this risk.	One financial support mechanism available from DEDE was earmarked for installing mitigation measures to improve energy efficiency, but technical assessment is required. However, the pandemic change the direction both financial institutions and enterprises. They will delay on any investment and focus on their liquidity.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Market risk: SMEs have limited willingness to invest additional funds for improved energy efficient measures.	Modest risk	Modest risk	The proposed measures for mitigation of this risk include: (1) Provision of capacity building assistance to different players in the market for increased awareness and availability of supportive financial mechanisms/policies for the development of appropriate market initiatives; (2) Promotional campaigns and capacity building to a variety of project stakeholders; and (3) Show casing of successful SME project demonstrations through the Information and Learning Platform and national partners. These measures will ensure that the market risks are minimized and their impact is reduced.	Based on pandemic situation all related progress will be postponed. Project will evaluate provision of capacity building again soon to increase willingness to invest for improve efficient measures.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Climate Change risk:	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	The key impacts of climate change in Thailand, as identified by the 4th Assessment Report of the IPCC, are: "severe flood risk, and a decline in annual flow of the Red and Mekong Rivers resulting in increased water stress." As it is unlikely that the project activities would be negatively impacted by the above outlined risks, the associated climate change risk has been assessed as low. Nevertheless, efforts will be made to mitigate any potential risk through an appropriate selection of project sites.	No change in risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>

6	<p>Social and Gender Risk: Resistance against or lack of interest in the project activities from stakeholders, especially with regard to the active promotion of gender equality.</p> <p>Low participation rates of suitable female candidates due to lack of interest, inadequate project activity or missing qualified female population within engineering sector.</p>	Modest risk (M)	Modest risk (M)	<p>The Thai industrial sector tends to be male-dominated, with very few women working in industrial facilities, thus making it more difficult to identify women participants for the various trainings and workshops. In an effort to overcome this barrier, the Project will pursue thorough and gender responsive communication and ensure stakeholder involvement at all levels, with special regard to involving women and men, as well as CSOs and NGOs promoting GEEW. This shall mitigate gender related risks, promote gender equality, create a culture of mutual acceptance, and maximize the potential contribution of the project to improving gender equality in the energy field.</p>	<p>Project is well aware of the gender dimension and tracks sex disaggregated data in all activities.</p>

2. If the project received a **sub-optimal risk rating (H, S)** in the previous reporting period, please state the **actions taken** since then to mitigate the relevant risks and improve the related risk rating. Please also elaborate on reasons that may have impeded any of the sub-optimal risk ratings from improving in the current reporting cycle; please indicate actions planned for the next reporting cycle to remediate this.

The overall risk assessment of the project was moderate in the previous period which remains the same for this reporting year too mainly due to prolonged Covid-19 crisis in the country and the region and also due to change in the Government priority and accordingly changing the role and responsibility of the executing agency.

3. Please indicate any implication of the **COVID-19** pandemic on the progress of the project.

The COVID-19 and its continue waves during the reporting period has severely affected the overall project progress and impacted the project implementation activities. It has also affected the project structure as the Government of Thailand took a decision to priorities their activities and mobilise their best resources and government officials first to stop or reduce the spread of pandemic and later on focus on strengthening of their healthcare system and socio economic situation of the country.

4. Please clarify if the project is facing delays and is expected to request an **extension**.

Yes, this project is facing delay and in the past two years during the pandemic time overall project progress specially demonstration related project activities were extremely slow. The Government of Thailand has recently assigned the executing agency's responsibility to another agency and assuming their orientation about the project and thereafter engaging in the decision making process, may further delay the project delivery or at least temporarily affect the momentum of the project activities. Considering these two important development, the project may need another one year extension in the future.

5. Please provide the **main findings and recommendations of completed MTR**, and elaborate on any actions taken towards the recommendations included in the report.

NA

IV. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

1. As part of the requirements for **projects from GEF-6 onwards**, and based on the screening as per the UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP), which category is the project?

- Category A project
- Category B project
- Category C project

(By selecting Category C, I confirm that the E&S risks of the project have not escalated to Category A or B).

Notes on new risks:

- *If new risks have been identified during implementation due to changes in, i.e. project design or context, these should also be listed in (ii) below.*
- *If these new/additional risks are related to Operational Safeguards #2, 3, 5, 6, or 8, please consult with UNIDO GEF Coordination to discuss next steps.*
- *Please refer to the UNIDO [Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures \(ESSPP\)](#) on how to report on E&S issues.*

Please expand the table as needed.

	E&S risk	Mitigation measures undertaken during the reporting period	Monitoring methods and procedures used in the reporting period
(i) Risks identified in ESMP at time of CEO Endorsement	N/A	N/A	N/A
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	N/A	N/A	N/A

V. Stakeholder Engagement

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes** regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project (based on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent document submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

Due to ongoing pandemic and changes in the project team structure, the interface and coordination activities between Ministry and PMU was not smooth. This has affected the stakeholder engagement in the recent time. To setup a new workable coordination mechanism and streamline all pending activities may require in person engagement and strong leadership at the field level. Therefore the current situation will be streamlined once the new executing agency Department of Industrial Works (DIW) get familiarise about the project and start monitoring project progress on a regular basis.

2. Please provide any feedback submitted by national counterparts, GEF OFF, co-financiers, and other partners/stakeholders of the project (e.g. private sector, CSOs, NGOs, etc.).

NA

3. Please provide any **relevant stakeholder consultation** documents.

No stakeholder consultation activity during the reporting period mainly due to pandemic and strict enforcement of social distancing norms.

VI. Gender Mainstreaming

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please report on the **progress achieved on implementing gender-responsive measures and using gender-sensitive indicators**, as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval (in the project results framework, gender action plan or equivalent),.

Gender-sensitive recruitments are being practiced at all possible levels, especially in the selection of project staff. Gender neutral TORs are used to mainstream gender in the activities of consultants and experts. In cases where the project does not have direct influence, gender-sensitive recruitment was encouraged.

VII. Knowledge Management

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on any **knowledge management activities / products**, as documented at CEO Endorsement / Approval.

Project activities and key technical knowledge were shared via the website.

2. Please list any **relevant knowledge management mechanisms/ tools** that the project has generated.

NA

VIII. Implementation progress

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes achieved/observed** with regards to project implementation.

The project implementation progress is affected due to ongoing Covid19 crisis and also the changes in the project structure. The Ministry of Industry (MOI) gave the project execution responsibilities Department of Industrial Works (DIW) as in the challenging time the original executing agency Department of Industrial Promotion (DIP) has a bigger objective to achieve that is revival of MSM sector and overall investment sentiments in the country. Therefore, the current situation may continue in the next few months before the pandemic situation improve at the country level. It will be more streamline once the new executing agency Department of Industrial Works (DIW) get familiarise about the project and start monitoring project progress on a regular basis.

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**⁶ to the approved project that may have been introduced during the implementation period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

Please tick each category for which a change has occurred and provide a description of the change in the related textbox. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Results Framework	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	

3. Please provide progress related to the **financial implementation** of the project.

Please provide a description of the main expenditures during the reporting period. Describe the current status of funds mobilization activities and the related implications for project implementation. Provide information on status of obtained / mobilized co-financing, etc. as per CEO Endorsement/Approval document.

⁶ As described in Annex 9 of the *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines*, **minor amendments** are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%.

UNIDO PROJECT DELIVERY REPORT		Project:	130279 - GREENING INDUSTRY THROUGH LOW CARBON TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS FOR SMES		Project Manager:	Sanjaya Shrestha	Project Validity:	Status:	05.12.2016 - 30.06.2023 Implement		
Reporting Period:	05.12.2016 - 30.06.2022		Project Theme:	Energy and Environment	Country:	Thailand	Region:	Asia and Pacific			
Sponsor Nr.	Sponsor	Grant	Grant Description	Fund	Currency	Grant Status	Grant Validity				
400150	GEF - Global Environment Facility	2000003470	GEF - THAILAND	GF	USD	Authority to implement	05.12.2016 - 30.06.2023				
	Description	Released Budget Current Year (a)	Obligations Current Year (b)	Disbursements Current Year (c)	Expenditures Current Year (d=b+c)	Total Agreement Budget (e)	Released Budget (f)	Obligations + Disbursements (g)	Funds Available* (h=f-g)	Support Cost (i)	Total Expenditures (j=g+i)
2000003470											
130279-1-01-01	Component 1: Policy Enhancement	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	4,148.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,019.18	4,019.18	(128.82)	4,148.00	0.00	(128.82)
1500	Local travel	5,011.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,605.16	9,605.16	4,593.73	5,011.43	0.00	4,593.73
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	26,950.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	91,459.94	91,459.94	54,509.72	38,950.22	0.00	54,509.72
2100	Contractual Services	28,244.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	113,301.97	113,301.97	75,057.57	38,244.40	0.00	75,057.57
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	24,203.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	796.13	34,203.87	0.00	796.13
4500	Equipment	1,932.78	0.00	9.90	9.90	3,959.38	3,959.38	2,036.50	1,922.88	0.00	2,036.50
5100	Other Direct Costs	1,608.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,552.54	5,552.54	3,943.69	1,608.85	0.00	3,943.69
9300	Support Cost IDC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,376.81	13,376.81
130279-1-01-01	Total	92,099.55	0.00	9.90	9.90	262,898.17	262,898.17	140,808.52	122,089.65	13,376.81	154,185.33
130279-1-01-02	Component 2: Capacity Build. & Implement	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	98,134.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	139,382.36	139,382.36	21,247.51	118,134.85	0.00	21,247.51
1500	Local travel	31,354.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	41,000.00	41,000.00	4,645.66	36,354.34	0.00	4,645.66
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	42,898.39	0.00	3,053.02	3,053.02	237,391.65	237,391.65	197,546.28	39,845.37	0.00	197,546.28
2100	Contractual Services	402,111.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	713,176.15	713,176.15	131,084.71	582,111.44	0.00	131,084.71
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	101,698.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	121,698.03	121,698.03	0.00	121,698.03	0.00	0.00
4500	Equipment	15,749.80	0.00	9.90	9.90	68,432.20	68,432.20	46,692.30	21,739.90	0.00	46,692.30
5100	Other Direct Costs	34,705.89	0.00	442.78	442.78	52,021.44	52,021.44	7,758.33	44,263.11	0.00	7,758.33
9300	Support Cost IDC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	38,850.91	38,850.91
130279-1-01-02	Total	726,652.74	0.00	3,595.70	3,595.70	1,373,101.83	1,373,101.83	408,954.79	964,147.04	38,850.91	447,805.70
130279-1-51-01	PMC	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	986.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,059.64	1,059.64	72.81	986.83	0.00	72.81
1500	Local travel	4,579.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,483.04	5,483.04	903.73	4,579.31	0.00	903.73
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	18,592.86	3,318.01	7,228.23	10,546.24	133,284.53	133,284.53	125,237.91	8,046.62	0.00	125,237.91
2100	Contractual Services	415.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,054.53	3,054.53	2,839.02	415.51	0.00	2,839.02
4500	Equipment	2,590.88	0.00	59.46	59.46	18,068.33	18,068.33	15,537.11	2,531.22	0.00	15,537.11
5100	Other Direct Costs	616.98	748.73	829.10	1,577.83	23,049.93	23,049.93	24,023.96	(974.03)	0.00	24,023.96
9300	Support Cost IDC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,999.68	15,999.68
130279-1-51-01	Total	27,782.17	4,066.74	8,116.79	12,183.53	184,000.00	184,000.00	168,414.54	15,585.46	15,999.68	184,414.22
130279-1-53-01	Monitoring and Evaluation Mngt	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	24,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,000.00	24,000.00	0.00	24,000.00	0.00	0.00
1500	Local travel	4,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	0.00	4,000.00	0.00	0.00
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	7,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,000.00	7,000.00	0.00	7,000.00	0.00	0.00
2100	Contractual Services	18,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18,000.00	18,000.00	0.00	18,000.00	0.00	0.00
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	7,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,000.00	7,000.00	0.00	7,000.00	0.00	0.00
130279-1-53-01	Total	60,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	0.00	60,000.00	0.00	0.00
2000003470	Total	906,534.46	4,066.74	11,632.39	15,699.13	1,880,000.00	1,880,000.00	718,177.85	1,161,822.15	68,227.40	786,405.25
130279	USD Total	906,534.46	4,066.74	11,632.39	15,699.13	1,880,000.00	1,880,000.00	718,177.85	1,161,822.15	68,227.40	786,405.25

For detail information kindly refer attached project delivery report

IX. Work Plan and Budget

1. Please provide an updated project work plan and budget for the remaining duration of the project, as per last approved project extension. Please expand/modify the table as needed.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to a file, in case it is submitted as an annex to the report.

Outputs by Project Component	2022				2023				2024				GEF Grant Budget Available (US\$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Component 1: Policy analysis and improvement for the promotion of low-carbon technologies within Thai SMEs													122,089.65

<i>Outcome 1.1: Improved understanding and awareness of existing policy gaps and enabling policies support the improvement of existing policy framework</i>												
Output 1.1.1: Policy Gap and Barrier Analysis conducted, and key policy recommendations proposed to Thai policy-makers												
Output 1.1.2: Awareness campaign on promoting low-carbon technologies for SMEs conducted												
Output 1.1.3: Financing schemes for the adoption of low-carbon technologies by SMEs facilitated and promoted												
Component 2: Capacity building and implementation of low-carbon technologies in SMEs												964,147.04
<i>Outcome 2.1: Improved capacity and knowledge management supports the improvement of energy efficiency in SMEs</i>												
Output 2.1.1: Technical capacity building on low-carbon technologies of local technical experts, equipment and service providers, banking/financial institutions and industry												
Output 2.1.2: An Information and Learning Platform (I&LP) on low-carbon technologies established and dissemination materials developed												
<i>Outcome 2.2: Increased competitiveness of selected SMEs as a result of increased adoption of low-carbon technologies and improved operating practices</i>												
Output 2.2.1: Implementation of low-carbon technologies in SMEs												
Component 3: Monitoring and Evaluation											60,000.00	
<i>Outcome 3.1: Effectiveness of the outputs assessed, corrective actions taken and experience documented</i>												
Output 3.1.1 Project and its activities monitored and evaluated on a regular basis in line with GEF, UNIDO, and government requirements.												
Output 3.1.2 Terminal Evaluation Report completed.												

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

NA

3. **Stories to be shared** (Optional)

NA

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022.
2. **Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the Division Chief and Director.
3. **Evaluation:** For the report to be used effectively as a tool for annual self-evaluation, project counterparts need to be fully involved. The (main) counterpart can provide any additional information considered essential, including a simple rating of project progress.
4. **Results-based management:** The annual project/programme progress reports are required by the RBM programme component focal points to obtain information on outcomes observed.

Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) ratings	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <u>all</u> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its <u>major</u> global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its major <u>relevant</u> objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modes overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve <u>some</u> of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <u>achieve only some</u> of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected <u>not</u> to achieve <u>most</u> of its major global environmental objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <u>any</u> of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of <u>all</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of <u>none</u> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.