



Chemicals and Wastes Financing Partnership Facility (CWFPF)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID 11681
Countries Global
Project Name Chemicals and Wastes Financing Partnership Facility (CWFPF)
Agencies ADB, UNIDO
Date received by PM 12/19/2025
Review completed by PM
Program Manager Anil Sookdeo
Focal Area Chemicals and Waste
Project Type FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

General Comment - There are many acronyms used throughout the project document without spelling them out. While a list of acronyms was uploaded in the documents section of the portal, to make the project more readable please spell out the acronym the first time it is used.

May 15, 2026 - comment cleared

Agency Response
ADB 13 May 2026

Acronyms in documents have been reviewed and relevant modifications made.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

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

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PMC is not proportionate between GEF financing (5% of sub-total GEF budget) and co-financing (1.7% of sub-total cofinancing). Please adjust the PMC budget to ensure equal burden sharing of admin costs between GEF financing and co-financing:

May 15, 2026 - comment cleared.

Agency Response
ADB 13 May 2026

Co-financing PMC has been adjusted for proportionality.

4. Project Outline

A. Project 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 project design?

b) Have 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 project outcomes? Is the private

sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

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

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project 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? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

In Component 2, Outcome 2, Chemicals and Wastes Financing Partnership Facility (CWFPF) established a steering group is proposed. It is unusual to have Convention Secretariats in the management of GEF projects. Please clarify the proposed role and propose an alternative that includes countries and the GEF SEC.

Component 4, Outcome 4, Output 4.1 - Energy Transition Mechanism (ETM) and Just Transition Platform - Ensure transformers are above 50 ppm PCB and carefully document the disposal activities and ensure they are included in the reporting on PCB to the Stockholm Convention. Additionally quantify mercury and POPs emissions reductions when the energy transitions are completed. For the Circular Pacific Regional Recycling Network, please also ensure that the GEF ISLANDS program in the Pacific is also coordinated with.

May 15, 2026 - comments cleared

Agency Response
ADB 13 May 2026

References to role of Convention Secretariats has been adjusted. Under CWFPF, the BRS and Minamata will be "strategic technical partners" and not participate in steering committee.

Narrative related to ETM and JT Platform with respect to PCBs has been adjusted as recommended.

Narrative on how links between GEF ISLANDS and the ADB CP-RNN will be supported has been provided in the section on "coordination".

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Dual role of implementing and execution by ADB: ADB is proposing to have dual role for ADB's allocation of the project because this is a global project with significant funding to private sector. Please note that this is not an NGI and the most appropriate criteria for a waiver of the dual role as per the GEF Guidelines is for global or regional platforms for knowledge sharing. Please revise the justification accordingly for GEFSEC's assessment and for management approval.

It is unclear in Figure 8: Institutional Arrangements CWFPF, if the CWFPF Advisory Group functions as the PSC for the overall project. Please clarify what is the management arrangement for the project and provide an overall organogram for the entire project. Please provide an organogram for the UNIDO implemented component of the project

The Convention Secretariats would better be placed in the Strategic Technical Partners.

May 15, 2025 - please provide the required justification for dual execution.

Agency Response
ADB 13 May 2026

The justification for ADB dual execution has been added for consideration. It should be noted that an Independent Fund Operations Management Group will be engaged for implementation, and at relative 'arm's length' to ADB.

Figure 8a is now inserted with added explanations in the narrative. A new Figure 8b now shows more detail on the UNIDO-led implementation with countries.

ADB 26 May 2026

The rationale for Agency (ADB) Execution has been strengthened and highlighted in the narrative.

5.3 Core indicators

- a) 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)?
- b) Are the project'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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

There are a significant reduction (several orders of magnitude) of the core indicator targets between the PIF and CEO Endorsement. After reviewing the notes on the GEB calculations, which should have been included under the core indicator table instead of the documents section of the portal, the rationale for the drastic reduction in targets is due to excessively high costs of process changes. Please be reminded that the GEF does not fund full costs, but incremental costs. Some cost estimates are based on projects from over a decade ago. Please revisit these costs and GEB's.

Additionally, the list of chemicals is missing for sub-indicator 9.1. Please disaggregate by chemical as this is required for all projects.

Results:

- i. For indicators with results data, in addition to cross-referencing the related annex, please briefly mention the methodology used to derive values.
- ii. Annex "24-10-22 REVISED ANNEX CWFPF Notes on GEB Calculations" indicates for indicators 9.8 and 10 that the underlying calculation covers a period of 10 years, a modelling horizon that extends well beyond project completion (project is set to last 60 months). This is inconsistent with the GEF-8 RMF principle to report only on results to be achieved by completion. Please recalculate targets to reflect results achievable within the project implementation period in the context of RMF reporting.
- iii. The value for indicators 6.1 on GHG emissions and 9.6 on mercury is not consistent with the justification provided in the annex. Please adjust where necessary.

May 15, 2026 - comments cleared

Agency Response
ADB 14 May 2026

Duration of accounting.

The accounting duration for all estimates provided in the CEO-ER was indeed 2 years for the pilot projects and 5 years for the Seed Investment initiatives. The estimates related to the sovereign project were not reported in the CEO-ER document. Therefore, the accounting duration reported in the CI table has been revised to the correct value of 5 years

All other Core Indicators have been reviewed and revised accordingly in the document. For more clarity the narrative and also revised worksheet have been included in the Roadmap as annex / appendix.

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures

under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

i. Institutional and Policy risk (Innovation). Please consider adjusting the low rating and related text to reflect this is a first-of-its-kind chemicals and wastes financing facility with institutional complexity involved.

ii. Stakeholder: as the facility will engage a wide range of stakeholders (investors, governments, operators), please consider elaborating further on this category and related engagement plans. Please ask agency to better elaborate on the potential roles of civil society organizations, community-based organization, youth and women networks/groups related to project objective and components, including approach and means to engage and consult these in project implementation.

iii. Other: the mentioned risk should be better placed under the Financial and Business Model category.

iv. Overall risk: please briefly elaborate on how this rating was ascertained.

May 21, 2026 - While we note the explanation provided on stakeholders there is no elaboration evident in the SEP. Please revise the SEP to provide details as requested.

It seems ESMF of CWFPF are going to be established as a part of project. Please clarify how ADB will report established ESMF for CWFPF and how the progress of environmental and social risk management on pilot projects will be regularly reported to GEF.

Agency Response

ADB 13 May 2026

i. This risk has been adjusted to "Moderate"

ii. For UNIDO: During PPG, a wide range of stakeholder consultation including governments, operators, civil society organization, as outlined in the SEP, have been conducted to ensure co-financing, inclusion into the project documents, as well as gender considerations was provided. Based on this stakeholder consultations, project inception will further details involvements, roles and responsibilities, especially for the pilots on electronics, pharmaceuticals and textiles.

For ADB and the CWFPF writ large: Civil society organizations, community-based organizations, women's groups, and youth networks are expected to play an important role in community outreach, awareness raising, behavioral change communication, and strengthening local ownership of project interventions. The CWFPF has clear engagement strategies for these groups across project components such as: (i) participation in stakeholder consultations; (ii) support for community education campaigns on chemical safety, waste segregation, recycling, and pollution prevention; (iii) mobilization of women and youth to promote inclusive participation; and (iv) community-based organizations will be mobilized to participate in pilot demonstration activities, local capacity building, and dissemination of good practices in waste reduction and environmentally sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste. A lot of this is articulated in the Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan (GESIAP). The Stakeholder Engagement Plan also provides information on means of engagement for a wide range of stakeholders, including vulnerable and affected groups, communities and civil society, for both ADB and UNIDO. This said, there are additional insights on now inserted on how ADB will address this in the narrative section under C4

related to the approach for ADB pipeline development. Further the Communications, Knowledge Management and Learning Strategy does indicate that capacity development, training and behaviour change communications will take a bespoke and audience-segmented approach.

iii. In the Risk Table, the stakeholder risk and the financial and business model risks have been duly modified.

iv. Overall risk explanation is provided.

ADB 26 May 2026

For ESMF: The Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) now contains a revised Section H on monitoring and reporting (version dated 25 May 2026). The section was expanded to clarify environmental and social monitoring, supervision, compliance verification, corrective actions, and reporting arrangements at both project and program levels. It also includes a section on ADB reporting processes to GEF. Please refer to the revised version dated 25 May 2026 and uploaded.

For SEP: The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been revised to expand stakeholder categorization and engagement approaches for CSOs, community-based organizations, women's groups, youth networks, informal workers, and vulnerable communities. Revisions include updates to stakeholder mapping, engagement methods, and implementation arrangements. Please refer to the revised version dated 25 May 2026 and uploaded.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

i. All entries currently classified as equity should be reviewed again to confirm whether they are truly equity or instead in-kind contributions. Under the GEF guidelines, equity is defined as an investment into a company or asset with the expectation of financial returns. It is not clear whether these entries meet that definition (most are related to salaries, equipment purchases etc). If financial returns are indeed expected, they can remain as equity. Otherwise, they should be reclassified as in-kind. The grant from Bayo Manila also appears more likely to be in-kind, as it seems to cover salaries, utilities, rental, and similar items, rather than grant financing. Please review these entries after reconfirming the nature of this co-financing.

ii. No co-financing letters have been submitted from ADB. Please submit them.

May 15, 2026 - comments cleared

Agency Response

ADB 13 May 2026

i. Entry for Bayo has been revised and other entries re-checked. Equity co-financing is classified because it represents a partner's own capital investment in assets it owns and maintains, bearing associated financial risks while contributing to project outcomes.

ii. ADB co-financing documentation has been provided in the Roadmap, and supported by narrative and summary table in the body of the CER in the section with financing tables.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please provide the missing endorsement letters for Viet Nam, Philippines and Thailand.

May 15, 2026 - comment cleared

Agency Response

ADB 13 May 2026

GEF OFP letters for all three countries (PHI, THA, VIE) provided. Note that for Viet Nam, UNIDO has already completed the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) assessment (which is on file with UNIDO).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Budget table:

- a. The Agency must utilize the template included in Annex 7 of the Guidelines (accessible here) - please abide to the categories included in the template, presenting the costs per Component (not per outcome) and the subtotals.
- b. The sub-total by components 4 and 5 between the Portal entry and the budget table differ. Please adjust to make them match:
- c. Remove the budget lines without costs involved.
- d. Revise the cost of the Fund Operations Manager (nearly \$1 million)
- e. Provide details on what Trainings, workshops and meetings + Travel International and National entails (see below)
- f. The CEO Endorsement Request Portal view, which is the document webposted after endorsement (see attached pdf file), has several formatting issues: (i) the budget table is unreadable, mainly because the correct format is not used as it includes outcomes; (ii) after page 80 till page 136, one finds the project components, that should have been included in the main text of the project. Please ask the Agency to revise.
- g. When resubmitted, we will review the budget table and provide comments if appropriate.

May 20, 2026

- 2. Budget table: please give more detailed information/description of the budget lines for UNIDO instead of just listing the expenditure categories.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component 1 (USDeq.)		Component 3		Component 4		Component 5		Sub-Total (UNIDO)	Sub-Total (ADB)	M&E	PMC	Sub Total (USDeq.) UNIDO	Sub Total (USDeq.) ADB	GRAND TOTAL ADB & UNIDO	Responsible Entity	
		UNIDO	ADB	ADB & UNIDO	ADB	ADB & UNIDO	ADB & UNIDO	ADB & UNIDO										
Goods	Laptops and software peripherals			10,000													ADB	
	Materials and goods (UNIDO)	11,000		18,000						34,000				34,000			Contracted parties	
SUB TOTAL		11,000		18,000		10,000		15,000		34,000				34,000		20,000		
Grants/ Sub-grants	Investment Readiness Support for Sovereign Lending and Investment Projects					8,240,000											ADB	
Revolving funds/ Seed funds /	Private Sector Seed Venture Investment Grant Funds					8,000,000											ADB	
SUB TOTAL						16,240,000				16,240,000						16,240,000		
Contractual Services – Individual	Graphics and Design Artist							110,000									ADB	
Contractual Services – Company	Operations and maintenance of knowledge hub and e-marketplace			500,000													ADB	
	Audio-visual production																ADB	
	Contractual services – companies (UNIDO) details in budget addendum and also ANNEXes J, K and L	352,000		5,593,125				215,000		6,160,125						6,160,125	PEE contracted parties	
SUB TOTAL		352,000		6,093,125				548,000		6,160,125				6,160,125		833,000		
International Consultants	Senior Chemicals Management Specialist					20,000		120,000									ADB	
	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist											100,000					ADB	
	Private Sector Finance Advisor					25,000		60,000									ADB	
	Knowledge Management and Learning Specialist							100,000									ADB	
SUB TOTAL	International consultants (UNIDO)	125,000		194,002						319,002				319,002		200,000	Contracted parties	
Local Consultants	Mapping and Deal Origination Specialist							125,000									ADB	
	Investment Care Specialist																ADB	
	Media Relations Officer			25,000				85,000									ADB	
	Gender, Environment and Social Safeguards Specialist					20,000		100,000									ADB	
	CWEPF Technical Associate		15,000	25,000		45,000		75,000									ADB	
	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists																ADB	
	National consultants (UNIDO)	517,000		820,000				180,000		1,517,000				324,500	1,841,500		Contracted parties	
SUB TOTAL		517,000		890,000		395,000		290,000		1,517,000				590,000	1,841,500		740,000	
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Fund Operations Manager																UNIDO	
	Administration and Finance Analyst																UNIDO	
SUB TOTAL																	954,000	
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Trainings, workshops and meetings					85,000		200,000										ADB
	workshops and conferences (UNIDO)	135,000		106,373						241,373				75,000	316,373		ADB	
Travel	International					20,000		53,000		75,000							ADB	
	Domestic					2,000		12,000		20,000							ADB	
	Travel (UNIDO)	60,000		125,000						185,000				13,500	198,500		UNIDO and	
SUB TOTAL		195,000		338,373		267,000		295,000		426,373				669,000	88,500	514,873	669,000	
Other Operating Costs	Misc/audits (UNIDO)														17,500		17,500	
	UNIDO M&E														150,000		150,000	
SUB TOTAL															167,500		167,500	
GRAND TOTAL		1,200,000	15,000	7,678,500		17,092,000	1,313,000	8,456,500		18,842,000	400,000	1,384,500	9,037,000	20,046,000	29,083,000			

Agency Response
ADB 13 May 2026

- a - c. The budget has been re-formatted for readability and presentation
- d. Fund Operations Manager adjusted. TORs for Key Personnel updated.
- e. Component 5 on KML provides a new narrative on some potential capacity development and trainings that may be created / adapted and delivered for CWFPF. International and national travel will be in support of capacity development and training, attendance at conferences, seminars and other types of meetings, and performance monitoring and site visits / study tours.
- f. We are not understanding this comment. The narrative on project components (outcomes, outputs, activity sets) already forms part of the Project Description, which is led by the Theory of Change discussion. In our version this appears on p 24; but for some reason this has been skewed in the Portal version that you have viewed.
- g. Please review at will.

ADB 26 May 2026

We have added some notes in the main consolidated (ADB+UNIDO) project budget.

We have also provided detailed breakdown and explanation of the UNIDO-associated budget. This is the file named "25-05-26 REVISED Appendix 3 UNIDO Demonstration Sub-project Detailed Budgets".

Hope this will be satisfactory.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

CEO Approval Response to Secretariat comments

First Review	3/18/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/21/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	