

Global Cleantech Innovation Programme: Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in start-ups and SMEs in Cambodia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10460

Countries

Cambodia

Project Name

Global Cleantech Innovation Programme: Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in start-ups and SMEs in Cambodia

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

10/18/2021

Program Manager

Ming Yang

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, the project remains aligned with the GEF7 CCM focal area strategy.

10/21/2021 MY:

The expected implementation date has been revised.

Agency Response

Question from 14/09/2021

1. Expected implementation start is already past, i.e. 9/1/2021. Please update to a later date.

UNIDO Response: The expected implementation start date has been revised to 01/01/2022.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. The project structure/design is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document. The GEF SEC appreciates the quantitative information for the targeted benefits of the project. If possible, please indicate the percentage of women and girls in the trainees and participants of the project.

Agency Response At least 35% women participants have been mentioned explicitly in the Output 1.1.2 , Output 1.1.3, Output 1.2.1, Output 1.2.2 in Table B, in the proposed alternative scenario and in Annex - A Project Results Framework.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. Co-financing letters are uploaded onto the GEF Portal.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. The GEF has reserved sufficient resources for the project.

10/18/2021 MY:

Yes. A new OFP endorsement letter was uploaded onto the GEF Portal. Issues were cleared.

But the GEF PPO made another comment that is related to the letter. Please address the following remaining comments from the GEF PPO unit:

Most of the comments provided on September 3rd by the GEF PPO were addressed excepting the second one that makes reference to the discrepancy in the GEF financing and Agency Fee at CEO Approval compared with the amounts approved by Council at PFD. The explanation provided by the Agency for not modifying the amounts is that the Regional Coordinator (Hannah) suggested the OFP to use the remaining STAR balance for projects already under preparation. For child projects, unfortunately, this is not possible.

Per the GEF Policy, the only manner to add funds to a child project of an already approved PFD is through an addendum to the already approved PFD ? details are in Annex 6 of the attached document.

Please follow the Council approved amounts in Table D of the PFD, and adjust GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610).

Agency Response
Question from 14/09/2021:

2. Table D of child project includes higher GEF Financing (\$1,418,830) and Agency Fee (\$127,695) than the Council approved GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610) in Table D of the Program Framework Document (PFD). Please amend accordingly and use the PDF numbers.

UNIDO Response: As per the attached letter (uploaded in Portal) from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to Mr. Tin Ponlok, Secretary General, Ministry of Environment, National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD) of Cambodia, he was informed that there was a balance of USD 1025 under the GEF-7 allocation. Also in email communication (uploaded in Portal as well) from Hannah Tomkinson Fairbank from the GEF to Mr. Ponlok, it was suggested to use this balance for projects already under preparation (i.e. GCIP Cambodia project). Hence, on the request of Mr. Tin Ponlok, this remaining balance was added to the GCIP Cambodia budget and submitted to the GEF for review. Thus, the revised figures became USD \$1,418,830 (USD 940 was added to the previously agreed project budget of USD 1,417,890). In addition, the Agency Fee became 127,695 (USD 85 was added to the previously agreed agency fee of USD 127,610).

Question from 18/10/2021:

Most of the comments provided on September 3rd by the GEF PPO were addressed excepting the second one that makes reference to the discrepancy in the GEF financing and Agency Fee at CEO Approval compared with the amounts approved by Council at PFD. The explanation provided by the Agency for not modifying the amounts is that the Regional Coordinator (Hannah) suggested the OFP to use the remaining STAR balance for projects already under preparation. For child projects, unfortunately, this is not possible.

Per the GEF Policy, the only manner to add funds to a child project of an already approved PFD is through an addendum to the already approved PFD ? details are in Annex 6 of the attached document.

Please follow the Council approved amounts in Table D of the PFD, and adjust GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610).

UNIDO Response: Following the GEF Secretariat recommendation, the project document has been resubmitted along with the resubmission of the Letter of Endorsement from the OFP (as of 29 May 2019 with the total budget allocation of USD 1,600,000). To reflect the Council approved GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610), USD 940 was removed from the previously submitted project budget and USD 85 was removed from the Agency Fee. As a result, minor changes have been made in Part -1 (Table A, Table B, Table D), Part-2 (Table 2), Annex E Project Budget

Table. A revised Budget has also been submitted in the Documents section. In addition, a Q and A document has also been uploaded in the Documents section.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. Annex C is attached to the CEO AR document.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. The core indicator targets are presented on page 15 of the CEO AR document.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on page 48 of the CEO AR.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 34.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 44.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. The project is well aligned with the GEF7 CCM focal area.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 73-75.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 75-78.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 78-80.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on page 85.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 85-86.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 88-99 of the CEO AR and in Annex J.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 99 -114 of the CEO AR and in Annex K.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 114-115.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Plases do more analysis on Climate Risk Screening. Specifically, please double check to ensure that climate risks are identified, listed and described per the guidance of STAP. See <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

This includes but not limited to:

1. Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations, which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc.).
2. Showing risks with a time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050).
3. Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above. This means elaborating a narrative that describes how the climate scenarios indicated above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050.
4. Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and climate risk mitigation measures during PPG. The STAP guidance shows more details on it.

8/31/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response Requested analysis has been provided in paragraphs 176 to 191.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

The private sector stakeholders such as the owners of the SMEs are very important in the project. It seems that Figure 6 in the CEO AR does not include SMEs. Please add these stakeholders. In addition, other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area should be elaborated and included in the coordination.

Figure 8 on page 119 is not clear. Please attached a chart with higher resolution.

8/31/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

Based on the GEF Sec comment, it seems that Figure 6 and 8 are referring to the figure in the Institutional Arrangement and coordination section (Figure 8). The figure has been updated to include SMEs and is also in a higher resolution above 192. Bilateral and national initiatives that this project could synergize with has been included in the coordination section (Paragraph 200).

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, as shown on pages 125-126, the project is consistent with the national priorities of the country.

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
6/28/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

In the section of Knowledge Management, please rearrange the information in the following way:

1. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project document
2. plans to learn from relevant projects in Ukraine
3. proposed processes to capture, assess and document information, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
4. proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration
5. proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders
6. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability in Ukraine
7. plans for strategic communications

8/31/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response Requested analysis has been provided from Paragraph 217 to Paragraph 229.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 129-130.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

On page 93, please also elaborate how these socioeconomic benefits will translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits.

8/31/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response Requested information has been provided in Paragraph 236.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. All Annexes are attached to the CEO AR document.

10/18/2021 MY:

Yes. Comments were addressed, and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

Question from 14/09/2021

3. In the budget table, audits are wrongly charged to M&E Plan while they should be charged to Project Management Costs (PMC). Please update accordingly.

UNIDO Response: The Project's audits are now charged to the Project Management Costs (PMC). PMC costs have been adjusted and is under 10% of the project finance.

4. Knowledge Management (KM). The project has a comprehensive knowledge management activity following the Knowledge Management Approach. However, in the budget table, the budget for the KM activities (Output 3.1.2) is only for the first year, "To develop a knowledge communication, and advocacy strategy framework (\$9,000)". As described in the overview of deliverables relevant for knowledge management, each deliverable must have clear budget for following year not only for the first year. Please update and provide a KM budget for years 2 to 5.

UNIDO Response: The knowledge management budget has been revised and has also been provided for Years 2-5.

5. The budget table in the CEO Endorsement document (i.e. GEF Portal) is illegible. Please include a readable budget. Perhaps the Agency can consider presenting the budget per outcome instead of per output, so the table will be slimmer and will fit within the margins.

UNIDO Response: The budget table in the CEO Endorsement document (GEF Portal) has been updated and includes the budget per outcome.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/28/2021 MY:

Yes. It is attached in Annex A.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, the comments of Germany and the US have been addressed in Annex B.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented in Annex C.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/28/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented in Annex D.

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
6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

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

6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

11/2/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

10/5/2021 MY:

Not at this time. Please address the following comments with supporting documents:

2. No. As per the email communication uploaded in the portal a new LoE will need to be issued in order to include the funds in a project currently under design. This new LoE has not been provided. Please submit a new LoE with his request or update the figures accordingly. -

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf

The Program Manager could not find the new LoE in the Portal as of October 5, 2021. Please ask the OFP to issue a new LoE.

UNIDO Response: The new LOE reflecting the updated STAR allocation to the project i.e. USD 1,601,025, as requested, has been issued by the Cambodia OFP and has been uploaded to the documents section.

3. No. Under Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" audits still appear in the M&E table. Please remove audits from here since they shall be charged to PMCs. By removing this item the total M&E budget shall be updated to US\$ 81,025 to make it in line the M&E budget in Annex E "Project Budget Table."

UNIDO Response: The row Annual financial and technical audit has been removed in the table under Section 9. The table has been updated and is consistent

with the M & E budget in Annex E of the GEF CEO Document. An updated budget has been uploaded in the documents section (named Others_Annex E Project Table Budget GCIP Cambodia 07102021 Final Submission) along with the screenshot of the summary of budget in the Annex E: Project Budget Table.

In the new submission package, the Program Manager could not find the revised or new CEO Approval Document. The most recent revisions of UNIDO on the project therefore could not be checked or verified. Please double check the submission and make sure all necessary documents are submitted to the GEF Portal.

UNIDO Response: As a result of updating the budget, the changes have been highlighted in yellow in Table B: Project Description Summary, Table 2 under 1a. Project Description and Table 9 M &E budget in Section 9.

In addition, please pay attention to the following:

1. The MS- Excel sheet named "Annex E Project Budget Table..." submitted on 9/23/2021 contains errors of circular references in math calculations. Please revise the MS-Excel Sheet and resubmit it. **UNIDO Response:** There was one instance of circular reference in the Summary sheet of the Budget. The error was fixed and now there are no circular references in the latest updated Budget.
2. In the future whenever submitting the new version of the documents, please prepare a Q&A word document and put the GEF comments in one column and UNIDO's responses in another. That way, UNIDO will easily make sure all comments are addressed. **UNIDO Response:** As requested, a separate Q and A document has been uploaded in the documents section.
3. Finally, UNIDO can put the responses to the above comments in the box of Agency Response to the previous question, which is just above this box: "**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**" **UNIDO Response:** UNIDO Responses have also been included in the suggested location in the review sheet.

Question from 18/10/2021:

Most of the comments provided on September 3rd by the GEF PPO were addressed excepting the second one that makes reference to the discrepancy in the GEF financing and Agency Fee at CEO Approval compared with the amounts approved by Council at PFD. The explanation provided by the Agency for not modifying the amounts is that the Regional Coordinator (Hannah) suggested the OFP to use the remaining STAR balance for projects already under preparation. For child projects, unfortunately, this is not possible.

Per the GEF Policy, the only manner to add funds to a child project of an already approved PFD is through an addendum to the already approved PFD ? details are in Annex 6 of the attached document.

Please follow the Council approved amounts in Table D of the PFD, and adjust GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610).

UNIDO Response: Following the GEF Secretariat recommendation, the project document has been resubmitted along with the resubmission of the Letter of Endorsement from the OFP (as of 29 May 2019 with the total budget allocation of USD 1,600,000). To reflect the Council approved GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610), USD 940 was removed from the previously submitted project budget and USD 85 was removed from the Agency Fee. As a result, minor changes have been made in Part -1 (Table A, Table B, Table D), Part-2 (Table 2), Annex E Project Budget Table. A revised Budget has also been submitted in the Documents section. In addition, a Q and A document has also been uploaded in the Documents section.

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

6/28/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/28/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

The Agency needs to address the comments above.

8/31/2021 MY:

All comments were addressed and issues were cleared. The PM recommends this project for PPO review and comments.

9/14/2021 PM:

No. Please address the following additional comments:

1. Expected implementation start is already past, i.e. 9/1/2021. Please update to a later date.
2. Table D of child project includes higher GEF Financing (\$1,418,830) and Agency Fee (\$127,695) than the Council approved GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610) in Table D of the Program Framework Document (PFD). Please amend accordingly and use the PDF numbers.
3. In the budget table, audits are wrongly charged to M&E Plan while they should be charged to Project Management Costs (PMC). Please update accordingly.
4. Knowledge Management (KM). The project has a comprehensive knowledge management activity following the Knowledge Management Approach. However, in the budget table, the budget for the KM activities (Output 3.1.2) is only for the first year, "To develop a knowledge communication, and advocacy strategy framework (\$9,000)". As described in the overview of deliverables relevant for knowledge management, each deliverable must have clear budget for following year not only for the first year. Please update and provide a KM budget for years 2 to 5.
5. The budget table in the CEO Endorsement document (i.e. GEF Portal) is illegible. Please include a readable budget. Perhaps the Agency can consider presenting the budget per outcome instead of per output, so the table will be slimmer and will fit within the margins.

9/29/2021 PM:

No. Please address the following remaining comments:

1. Cleared.

2. No. As per the email communication uploaded in the portal a new LoE will need to be issued in order to include the funds in a project currently under design. This new LoE has not been provided. Please submit a new LoE with his request or update the figures accordingly. -

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf

3. **No.** Under Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" audits still appear in the M&E table. Please remove audits from here since they shall be charged to PMCs. By removing this item the total M&E budget shall be updated to US\$ 81,025 to make it in line the M&E budget in Annex E "Project Budget Table."

4. **Cleared.**

5. **Cleared.**

10/5/2021 MY:

Not at this time. Please address the following comments with supporting documents:

2. **No.** As per the email communication uploaded in the portal a new LoE will need to be issued in order to include the funds in a project currently under design. This new LoE has not been provided. Please submit a new LoE with his request or update the figures accordingly. -

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf

The Program Manager could not find the new LoE in the Portal as of October 5, 2021. Please ask the OFP to issue a new LoE.

3. **No.** Under Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" audits still appear in the M&E table. Please remove audits from here since they shall be charged to PMCs. By removing this item the total M&E budget shall be updated to US\$ 81,025 to make it in line the M&E budget in Annex E "Project Budget Table."

In the new submission package, the Program Manager could not find the revised or new CEO Approval Document. The most recent revisions of UNIDO on the project therefore could not be checked or verified. Please double check the submission and make sure all necessary documents are submitted to the GEF Portal.

In addition, please pay attention to the following:

1. The MS- Excel sheet named "Annex E Project Budget Table..." submitted on 9/23/2021 contains errors of circular references in math calculations. Please revise the MS-Excel Sheet and resubmit it.
2. In the future whenever submitting the new version of the documents, please prepare a Q&A word document and put the GEF comments in one column and UNIDO's responses in another. That way, UNIDO will easily make sure all comments are addressed.

3. Finally, UNIDO can put the responses to the above comments in the box of Agency Response to the previous question, which is just above this box: **"Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)"**

Thank you.

10/21/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

Please address the following remaining comments from the GEF PPO unit:

Most of the comments provided on September 3rd by the GEF PPO were addressed excepting the second one that makes reference to the discrepancy in the GEF financing and Agency Fee at CEO Approval compared with the amounts approved by Council at PFD. The explanation provided by the Agency for not modifying the amounts is that the Regional Coordinator (Hannah) suggested the OFP to use the remaining STAR balance for projects already under preparation. For child projects, unfortunately, this is not possible.

Per the GEF Policy, the only manner to add funds to a child project of an already approved PFD is through an addendum to the already approved PFD ? details are in Annex 6 of the attached document.

Please follow the Council approved amounts in Table D of the PFD, and adjust GEF Financing (\$1,417,890) and Agency Fee (\$127,610).

11/2/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared. The Agency's responses can be found the above second box of Agency responses. The PM recommends technical clearance for this project.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	6/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/31/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/5/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2021

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The objective of the project is to accelerate the uptake and investments in cleantech innovations and promote coordination and ecosystems connectivity under the Global Cleantech Innovation Program. The project consists of three major components: (1) Transforming early-stage innovative cleantech solutions into commercial enterprises; (2) Cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem (CIEE) strengthening and connectivity; and (3) Project Coordination and Coherence. Project outputs include (1) An early-stage development fund is created to provide pre-seed and seed financing support to entrepreneurs and startups (at least 12 firms (with 35% women participants) achieving eligibility criteria); and (2) Technology verification, product development and market entry support is provided (at least 15 start-ups (with at least 35% women participants) for post-acceleration support per year). With \$1.4 million of grant, this project will mobilize a total of more than \$7.1 million of co-financing from the government and CSOs. The project aims at mitigating 756,000 tonnes of CO2 during its lifetime operation.

COVID-19 risk analysis: COVID -19 may cause several risks to this project. These include: (1) technical expertise is not readily available due to the pandemic; (2) Possible re-instatement of COVID-19 containment measures limits available capacity or effectiveness of project execution/ implementation; (3) Some project supporters, co-financiers or beneficiaries may not be able to continue with project execution/implementation; and (4) Price increases for procurement of goods/services. But all these risks will be mitigated by effective measures, including (1) flexible

planning to reschedule activities onsite that require specific expertise; (2) strengthening capacity of stakeholders and the beneficiaries for remote work; (3) actively looking for additional co-financing resources to back up; and (4) finding alternative goods and service providers to back up.

COVID-19 opportunities: Remote working arrangements and no-contact business modalities will require solutions that can be turned into new business models. Examples of former GCIP alumni responding to new business opportunities by providing innovative solutions during the pandemic are summarized in the following link: <https://www.unido.org/stories/cleantech-innovators-take-covid-19>.