Accelerating sustainable energy transition for decarbonization of micro, small and medium manufacturing enterprises in India

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11758
Countries
India
Project Name
Accelerating sustainable energy transition for decarbonization of micro, small and medium manufacturing enterprises in India
Agencies
UNIDO
Date received by PM
12/19/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Remy Ruat
Focal Area
Climate Change
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
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Taxonomy is not up to date - please see the taxonomy used at PIF stage and revise as needed based on evolutions in project design.

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. Taxonomy has been revised and updated in line with the PIF stage taxonomy and current project design

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Please revise the CCM Rio Marker to 2 consistently with PIF

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. The CCM Rio Marker has been revised to 2, consistent with PIF.

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
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Please refer to comments made at PIF stage regarding framing of the summary. Some of the initial issues are back in the CEO draft, that had been addressed at PIF stage, such as the framing of MSMEs as a sector, which is inaccurate (the focus is rather on industrial sector through support to MSMEs), or a reference clarifying the importance of the targeted industrial segment in country GHG emissions and related targets (the 50% data mentioned in PIF). A brief reminder of the target in terms of beneficiaries would also be welcome.

2. Thank you for also revising the summary as needed based on revisions made to project design in line with comments made in the rest of this review sheet.

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. Reframed summary to open with India?s industrial sector as the main subject, clarifying that MSMEs are an enterprise category within this sector rather than a separate ?MSME sector", while restoring the ?approximately 45?50% of industrial output? data point and explicitly named the eight priority sub-sectors.

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
Cleared

RR (5/26/2026)

1. Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. This has not been addressed

Indicative Project Overview

Project Objective

The project aims to support the decarbonization and reduction of energy consumption in Indian MSMEs in the industrial sector by implementing integrated energy efficiency measures, promoting energy substitution, and introducing innovative solutions to minimize environmental impacts while enhancing productivity, competitiveness, and business resilience.

2. Cleared

3. Noted

RR (1/15/2026):

PMC proportional, pending co-financing confirmation.

1. Project objective statement changed since PIF and is now unclear. Please see prior comments on the target sector (industry decarbonization through MSMEs) for revision.

2. It is impossible to verify gender dimensions are budgeted for as the budget table does not respect GEF format. Please see comments on budget table and revise so that GAP budget can be identified in the budget table.

3. Please ensure at the end of the project review to reflect in the project overview table any change made to the project design.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. Objective reframed from ?MSME sector transition? to ?industrial decarbonization through MSMEs,? with eight priority sub-sectors referenced; ?measurable and durable GHG emission reductions? provides a clear results anchor, and ?strengthened policy coherence? signals the cross?ministerial dimension.

2. GAP-linked budget mapping completed, with 14 GAP-linked outputs identified across 5 components and a dedicated GAP budget of USD 800,000 (approximately 8.9% of the GEF grant), ensuring resources for implementation of gender-responsive activities. Annex L has been prepared with 12 actions, aligned with these outputs and corresponding budget lines.

3. Overview table revised, with component budgets adjusted for Coordinator reallocation (Component 1: USD 890,000; Component 2: USD 1,257,000; Component 3: USD 5,544,000; Component 4: USD 440,000; PMC: USD 603,000) and GAP?tagged outputs identified.

UNIDO (13/05/2026)

1. The objective has been reframed to under 45 words, foregrounding industrial decarbonization as the primary purpose with MSMEs positioned as the delivery channel.

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

Cleared

RR (6/3/2026)

1. Thank you for the details, this clarifies. cleared.

RR (5/26/2026)

1. This is not addressed in the CEO ER. Please see also related comment in the description section.

2. Cleared

3. Cleared

4. Noted

RR (5/4/2026)

Thank you for the consolidated sections added to the rationale, which is clearer now

1. In the baseline section, it is noted that "the SME Programme, which seeks to extend energy auditing and benchmarking services to small and medium enterprises across selected sectors and clusters (...) represents a significant policy signal toward MSME energy efficiency, but its coverage remains nascent, reaching fewer than 500 enterprises as of 2025" - could you please clarify why this coverage remains limited and how this project, in coordination with the BEE, could help address this? Please also see corresponding comment in the project description section, to clarify how the project can add value given this pre-existing work and address the barriers identified.

2. there has been a confusion on the interpretation of BAU - what was meant by previous comments is that the scenario to be described is the scenario without the project - this being said, it is not the same as a "business as usual climate scenario" - please amend the sentences describing India's GHG pathway under BAU scenario - it should be the assumption that India will still strive towards its NDC targets overall in all sectors without this project - it is just the industrial related sub-targets that may not see their potential fully realized in the absence of the project.

3. Please see above comment on project objective, which is still less clear than at PIF stage in terms of sectoral focus (and is a bit longer than necessary).

4. The PIF review sheet noted the following points for clarification at CEO ER stage, for which the current project description is a bit unclear - could you please clarify how they have been addressed and reflect the corresponding revisions on the CEO ER document based on information available?

> *Further baseline information on market penetration and adoption rates (for MSMEs) for energy efficiency and technology interventions covered by the project*

> *Further building on the baseline of existing initiatives, policies, projects, with the phased approach as described - initial analysis during PPG to inform project design, more detailed during implementation to inform vision/planning development*

RR (1/15/2026):

Project reviewer could not complete the review of this section, as it is not in line with expectations from a CEO ER document and seems like it was not quality controlled. The project rationale contains less information than what was available at PIF stage and does not contain most of the key required information expected (both at PIF or at CEO ER stage). Our understanding is that PPG assessment on this topic was not yet fully concluded and that a summary was included instead.

In the resubmission, thank you for checking the PIF review sheet for the type of information asked then, including pending matters where more details had been requested to be explored during PPG, and for revising the PIF comprehensively in order to

(i) outline a clear baseline of the existing policies, targets and responsible/concerned stakeholders in the sector and their role, underlying sectoral trends and challenges as they related to decarbonization, existing initiatives and investments, both domestic and with international support including GEF,

(ii) summarize lessons learned from past projects of relevance to this initiative,

(iii) describe in details the main barriers and enablers, with supporting examples (including based on lessons learned noted above)

(iv) outline how the situation would be expected to evolve without the project in the future, without assuming that nothing would happen (e.g. accounting for the progress expected with ongoing initiatives and clarifying where there are gaps remaining, with supporting justification),

(v) outline how key socio-economic drivers of the targeted system would be expected to evolve in the future that may impact the success or sustainability of project outcomes (including climate risks, but also price signals, etc),

(vi) on the basis of this situation analysis outline the project's objective.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

The project rationale section has been comprehensively revised in line with CEO ER expectations and earlier PIF review guidance.

i) A clear baseline now maps existing BEE, MNRE and MoMSME policies and targets, responsible stakeholders and their roles, underlying sectoral trends and decarbonization challenges, and key domestic and international (including GEF?supported) initiatives and investments

ii) Lessons learned from relevant past GEF?4, GEF?5 and GEF?7 projects and other initiatives have been summarized, highlighting practices and insights that inform the present project design.

iii) The main barriers and enablers are described in detail across policy, financial, technical and information dimensions, with concrete examples, including those derived from the lessons learned.

iv) A BAU scenario has been elaborated that reflects expected evolution without the project, acknowledging progress from ongoing initiatives while identifying remaining gaps and structural limitations, with supporting justification.

v) Key socio?economic drivers, including climate risks, price signals (e.g. CBAM?related developments), demographic trends and other factors are outlined and discussed in terms of their implications for the success and sustainability of project outcomes.

vi) On the basis of this situation analysis, the project objective has been reformulated to clearly reflect industrial decarbonization through MSMEs within the wider industrial sector.

UNIDO (13/5/2026):

1) Added four causal explanations for the below-target enterprise covering gap and links to each corresponding Output

2) The BAU framing is recast as a without-project counterfactual rather than a national BAU climate scenario. The CSTEP figure is retained but explicitly recharacterized as the residual MSME-segment gap, not national emissions.

3) Objective has been reframed and consistent throughout the document.

4) An explicit MSME technology-penetration baseline has been added across sub-sector and technology-family categories, together with a phased baseline-deepening narrative, addressing outstanding clarification requests raised in the PIF review sheet and not fully resolved at CEO ER stage; supporting sources are identified as the PPG Baseline Energy Assessment Report and Annex P.

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
Cleared

RR (6/3/2026)

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (5/26/2026)

1. Unclear - SIDBI is said to be the primary entry point for working with financial institutions, yet co-financing is not confirmed? Does this not pose a structural risk for the likelihood of success of the project?

2. Comment not addressed. Please see the highlighted part for reference (related to the pending comment above in rationale).

RR (5/4/2026)

1. The PIF review sheet noted the following points for clarification at CEO ER stage, for which the current project description is a bit unclear - could you please clarify how they have been addressed and reflect the corresponding revisions on the CEO ER document based on information available?

> *Further materializing the balance between TA/KM and investment activities, in particular through partnership with DFIs and commercial/development banks*

> *Further exploration of executing partner opportunities for ministries that may be able to provide sectoral decarbonization guidance and long term vision to this work; and similarly on supply chain level engagement at multi-stakeholder level* (please see follow up comment just below)

2. This has not been addressed. In spite of a clearer situation analysis identifying the needs for engagement across ministries, the MoMSME and its related stakeholders are still the only execution partners of this project, and the BEE and MNRE do not appear in the project description - key questions raised in the project rationale remain without a corresponding answer in the theory of change- such as for example, why is it that the BEE SME Programme coverage only reached fewer than 500 enterprises as of 2025 and what could this project do to remedy this ; or similarly for barriers for MNRE related to procurement for open access or captive renewable energy; or the lack of integrated policy framework or inter-ministerial coordination mechanism to harmonize mandates around MSME-scale energy transition.

3. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Please see comments made on project description/theory of change at PIF stage, including pending points that needed to be further explored at PPG stage, and address.

2. The main issue identified at PIF stage (beyond the issue of the baseline assessment), was one of policy coherence and institutional arrangements, with only the lens of the Ministry of MSME taken to assess sectoral issues and priorities, missing in the landscape assessment and in the related actions the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy and the Bureau of Energy Efficiency, none of which seem to have been consulted nor included as part of the design of this project (and we cannot verify this as the stakeholder engagement plan and related documentation are not submitted yet), in spite of the explicit note made during PIF on this issue. This contributes to explain both the issues persisting in the situation analysis, which still only take the MSME ministry lens, and the corresponding incompleteness of the theory of change, which only cover the mandate of this ministry, and does not include any identification of opportunities related to already existing frameworks covered through mandates of other ministries, nor of any opportunities for cross-ministerial collaboration to address issues of policy coherence (instead expanding the development of new and potentially duplicative roadmaps). At this point, the only issue of policy coherence apparent in the project theory of change is the focus on one executing partner, the Ministry of MSME, when designing this project. Thank you for meaningfully consulting with relevant stakeholders that have a stake in or a mandate on the issue that this projects seeks to address, and for reflecting the outcome in a project design which addresses issues identified since PIF stage.

3. The core indicator justification annex mentions that the following actions will be covered by the project :

? Installation of solar PV systems for captive power generation

? Replacement/retrofitting of energy-efficient motors, pumps, compressors

? High-efficiency boilers and thermal systems

? Waste heat recovery systems

? LED lighting and efficient cooling

? Process optimization and energy management systems

Thank you for clarifying what high efficiency boilers and thermal systems correspond to in terms of energy source - any boilers or thermal system relying on fossil fuels, even with energy efficiency improvements, would not be eligible for GEF funding, as noted during PIF. The same question would go for the replacement of motors and related equipment, if applied to FF based systems.

More broadly, as noted at PIF stage, the actions and technologies to be financed in terms of industrial decarbonization through this project should be explicitly and exhaustively listed in the project description, to confirm eligibility.

4. We will revert back with further comments once the issues identified at PIF stage have been addressed and an updated project description resubmitted.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. The theory of change now presents a more detailed staged causal chain from enabling environment and capacity building through investment mobilization, learning and M&E, with explicit assumptions and risk mitigation measures.

Related clarifications on emission reduction targets are reflected in the revised Annex P with differentiated energy rates and stakeholder engagement aspects are addressed through the completed Gender Action Plan in Annex L.

2. An explicit cross?ministerial coordination assumption bringing BEE and MNRE has been added into the theory of change, addressing the concern that the ToC previously reflected only MoMSME?s mandate. BEE DDG Ashok Kumar participated in the national consultation on 3 November 2023, EESL has been confirmed as the partner for Component 3, and MNRE engagement is ensured through coordination on Green Energy Open Access.

3. An exhaustive technology list has been added, covering five categories and more than 60 eligible technologies, with information on technology readiness level, indicative capital cost ranges, expected efficiency gains and sector applicability to different MSME sub?sectors. The list now includes an explicit fossil?fuel exclusion statement, clarifying that ?high?efficiency boilers? are limited to non?fossil?fuel systems and that motor replacements are restricted to applications that reduce electricity consumption, so that all supported investments are fully consistent with GEF eligibility requirements.

UNIDO (13/5/2026):

1. Further materializes the balance between TA/KM and investment activities through an explicit 30%/70% allocation split, and clarifies the proposed DFI/commercial-development bank partnership architecture, with SIDBI identified as the primary partner and NABARD, SBI, and EXIM Bank referenced for engagement through inception-phase MoUs; an inception-phase amendment pathway has also been added to allow refinement of partnership arrangements as implementation advances.

2. Added three explicit causal answers one per rationale-stage question each tied to a specific Output, plus an explicit characterization of BEE and MNRE as co-implementing technical partners with the inception-phase amendment pathway

UNIDO (28/5/2026)

1. In view of the timeline for SIDBI's internal approval not aligning with the GEF-8 Council window, the SIDBI co-financing line of USD 17.44 million (loans) has been removed from the Confirmed Co-financing Table; SIDBI's role is preserved as an ecosystem-level financing partner via the RAMP / Partial Risk Sharing Facility (PRSF) Window-2 channel, captured in the Investment-Mobilized table (Annex B-1) and in the Theory of Change as an implementation-phase mobilization commitment. The financial-institution entry-point function on which the project depends is therefore distributed across three channels rather than relying on a single confirmed counterparty: (i) the Ministry of MSME in-kind ministry channel (USD 5.4 million), which carries convening authority over CGTMSE, RAMP and ZED and, through these, over the public-sector banking system; (ii) Component 2 partner-led financial-institution engagement through CII-GBC's banking and DFI relationships and TERI's blended-finance work; and (iii) the implementation-phase investment-mobilization commitments from the five industry associations (USD 71.1 million+, Annex B-1), each intermediated through its own banking and lender relationships. The structural risk to likelihood of success that would arise from sole reliance on a single unconfirmed financial-institution counterparty is therefore mitigated by the distributed architecture of the FI entry-point function.

2. The following additions/revisions have been incorporated and highlighted in orange in the CEO ER:

•**Baseline / Project Rationale:** The earlier statement that the BEE SME Programme had reached ?fewer than 500 enterprises? has been corrected and replaced with a fuller account of BEE?s outreach and achievements. The revised text also reframes the core challenge as the *audit-to-investment translation gap* in MSME decarbonization, identifying the main structural barriers behind it.
•**Project Description / Theory of Change:** A new section has been added explaining how the project?s cluster-based delivery model will close the audit-to-finance gap through demand aggregation, investment bundling, convergence with MSME schemes, and deployment of BEE-accredited auditors.
•**Project Description / MNRE-side Barriers:** Additional text has been inserted to address MNRE-related challenges such as regulatory variability in open access, MSME concerns with PPA models, and renewable energy capex barriers. The revisions also explain the proposed RE-EE bundling and RESCO/PPA demonstration approach.
•**Governance / Inter-ministerial Coordination:** A new governance subsection has been added establishing formal coordination mechanisms between MoMSME, BEE, and MNRE through PSC observer roles and proposed MoUs defining technical collaboration responsibilities.

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
Cleared

RR (6/16/2026)

Cleared

RR (6/10/2026)

a. From policy perspective :

Please clarify and confirm UNIDO?s participation in the Project Steering Committee as a non-voting member.

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Noted that arrangements have yet to be finalized - thank you for updating upon resubmission.

Agency Response
UNIDO (06/11/2026):

a. The text confirming UNIDO?s participation and clarifying its advisory role in the PSC, without voting rights, has been added under Institutional Arrangements / Project Governance, within the Project Steering Committee section.

UNIDO will be a member of the Project Steering Committee, participating in an advisory capacity, without exercising voting rights. All decisions adopted by the Project Steering Committee shall remain subject to UNIDO?s non-objection decision, exercised in its capacity as the Implementing Agency responsible for project supervision and oversight, in accordance with UNIDO?s applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

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
Cleared

RR (5/26/2026)

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. The core indicator values are noted under CI 6.1 in the table (AFOLU sector) > it should be moved to CI 6.2 (non-AFOLU sectors).

2. Please also correct the duration of accounting (it was set to 10 years at PIF stage, now only 2 years which seems like a typo).

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Energy savings : please update the energy savings core indicator value (missing for CEO ER) and clarify how the value was obtained - there are some numbers in Mtoe in the annex, while the indicator is in MJ.

2. Indirect emission reductions. Thank you for clarifying the expected impact pathways in the annex, this is useful. For the replication factor used - please apply an attribution factor on top of this to account for the fact that this indirect impact is expected to be caused by the interventions of multiple actors beyond those involved in this GEF investment. This attribution factor should not be above 20%.

3. Direct emission reductions. Please clarify how the following pending comment from PIF stage was addressed : *Currently, the proposed interventions lead to emission reductions that are far from sectoral potentials identified by the agency for the country. In other words, these may be achieved simply by purchasing more up to date equipment, not necessarily by implementing active and transformative energy efficiency measures. during PPG, please aim for a reduction of this gap by increasing the targetted impact from pilots so that they are closer to the sectoral benchmark mentionned in the analysis. The project should aim to reach an impact that is close to the sectoral benchmark potential, otherwise this would be business as usual financing.*

4. Under C.I.6.1, please complete the Anticipated start year of accounting.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. Energy savings converted from Mtoe to MJ as required, with CI?1 values updated accordingly and reflected consistently in the CEO document and Annex P.

2. A 20% attribution factor has been applied to indirect emission reductions: gross indirect reductions of 13.34 MtCO?e have been adjusted to 2.67 MtCO?e post?attribution, using a 1.45? replication factor and a 10% policy spillover, followed by the 20% GEF attribution.

3. The ambition gap in direct emission reductions has been addressed by increasing the per?MSME efficiency improvement target from 18% to 25?30% through deeper intervention packages (fuel switching, process optimization, renewable energy integration and waste?heat recovery) that go beyond simple equipment replacement; justification for GEF additionality has been provided and revised GHG calculations is in the updated Annex P.

4. The anticipated start year of accounting under CI?6.1 has been completed and is set to 2028.

UNIDO (13/5/2026):

1. The core indicator values moved to CI 6.2 (non-AFOLU sectors)

2. The accounting duration corrected to 10 years, consistent to PIF

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
Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Execution risk assessment is now included - please remove the bracketed text in the Fiduciary risk line, given that arrangements have been confirmed as noted above.

RR (1/15/2026):

E&S risk rating consistent.

1. Execution risks assessment is missing. Thank you for completing.

Agency Response
UNIDO (13/5/2026):

1. Bracketed text in the Fiduciary risk line removed

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 RequestN/A

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
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. The alignment with integrated programming criteria is not needed for this focal area project, please remove and replace by the PIF information already included initially on alignment of this project with CCM focal area objectives 1.1 and 1.2.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

The alignment with integrated programming criteria has been removed and the section now reflects the project?s alignment with CCM focal area objectives 1.1 and 1.2, consistent with the information provided at PIF stage.

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

Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Please complete the section on alignment with country priorities on the basis of PIF information already included initially on alignment of this project with country priorities (currently only NDC and LT-LEDS are included, we are missing broader sectoral strategy alignment). Please ensure additional elements of alignment with national priorities identified through PPG are also included.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

In the country priorities section, alignment has been expanded beyond the NDC and LT?LEDS to include NAPCC/NMEEE, the Energy Conservation Act and CCTS, make in India/RAMP/ZED, and relevant MNRE programmes, as required.

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

Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Please remove the section on alignment with KMGBF targets as this is not applicable for this project, the links are too indirect.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

Removed KMGBF targets section and CBD/NBSAP alignment

7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. We could not find the stakeholder engagement plan and gender action plan. Thank you for submitting - we may revert with further questions then on the basis of the full submission.

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):

Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan have now been uploaded as part of the resubmission.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (6/16/2026)

Cleared

RR (6/10/2026)

From a policy perspective

a. Could you please clarify how activities under the following outputs reflect aspects of advancing women?s empowerment or integrate gender dimensions?

Output 2.1.2: Skills development and training programs for MSME workers and managers

Output 2.2.3: Strengthening design, engineering, and manufacturing capacity for sustainable energy solutions

Output 2.2.6: Capacity building of supporting institutions for sustainable energy solutions delivery

b. Under Output 4.1.1: Gender-responsive knowledge products, could you please clarify whether this includes dedicated knowledge products on gains in advancing gender equality and women?s empowerment as well as any lessons learned? This appears important given that this project has dedicated a relatively significant budget allocation for its gender actions.

c. Under Output 5.1.2: Periodic monitoring, reporting, and GEBs tracking and Output 5.1.3: Independent mid-term review and terminal evaluation - could you please confirm that gender dimensions will be adequately captured and reflected in PIRs, MTR and TE given the focused interventions and budget allocation on gender-related actions?

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. We could not find the stakeholder engagement plan and gender action plan. Thank you for submitting - we may revert with further questions then on the basis of the full submission.

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan have now been uploaded as part of the resubmission.

UNIDO (06/11/2026):

a. Output 2.1.2: 30% female participation target with adaptive enablers; women-led MSME tracks and Women Entrepreneurship Cell partnership; female-instructor pipeline; sex-disaggregated participation, completion and outcome indicators; advanced women-only cohorts and female-mentor pipeline.

Output 2.2.3: 25% female-engineer representation target; targeted outreach via CII Indian Women Network and women's chapters; ergonomic/safety considerations in design context; sex-disaggregated indicators on women engineers, women-led MSMEs and technology adoption; women on selection panels and in Component-4 dissemination.

Output 2.2.6: Gender focal points in each institutional counterpart; capacity building for women officials and women's networks; gender component in institutional capacity assessments; gender-disaggregated reporting; women or inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms and as institutional gender champions.

Detailed activity-level treatment, KPI targets, baselines and budget tracking are in Annex L: Gender Analysis report and Action Plan.

b. Output 4.1.1 will deliver dedicated knowledge products and learning under the four headings; documentation of women's participation and leadership outcomes; case studies and success stories; lessons learned on advancing gender equality; and replicable models for women's inclusion in sustainable energy value chains.
The budget allocation under Output 4.1.1 is sized to deliver these gender focused knowledge deliverables - a cluster-level baseline study, periodic reports against Gender Action Plan KPIs, a case studies series, a lesson learned synthesis, and a Replication Toolkit - and not solely a general knowledge management work programme.

c. Gender dimension will be tracked and assessed throughout project implementation.
5.1.2 Gender disaggregated indicators across the Results Framework; PIRs to include a dedicated gender section reporting against Gender Action Plan KPIs and gender targets; periodic GAP-implementation review by PMU with reporting to the PSC; sex-disaggregated GEBs reporting per GEF STAR guidance.

5.1.3 MTR and TE ToRs to require gender expertise on the evaluation team, a dedicated gender assessment section and gender-disaggregated impact analysis, under UNIDO Evaluation Group/ UNEG quality standards (including the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations).

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

1. We could not find the stakeholder engagement plan and gender action plan. Thank you for submitting - we may revert with further questions then on the basis of the full submission.

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):
Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan have now been uploaded as part of the resubmission.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

submitted. Moderate risk

1. The document identified that ?[environmental] impacts disproportionately affect vulnerable groups?. However, it is not clear whether these vulnerable groups will be identified as priority beneficiaries of the project. Could you please clarify?

2. Other UNIDO projects classified as Moderate risk usually provided an ESMF. Could you please clarify where this ESMF can be found - as mentioned in the environmental and social screening document?

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. Vulnerable groups are explicitly treated as priority beneficiaries in the project. The project recognizes that environmental impacts from MSME manufacturing disproportionately affect women workers, informal workers, and communities living near industrial clusters, and responds through: (a) gender?responsive targeting measures under Components 2 and 3; (b) cluster?level environmental improvements from reduced pollution; (c) occupational health co?benefits from cleaner production practices; and (d) capacity?building activities designed to be accessible to micro?enterprises and informal workers.

2. The ESMF has now been uploaded with the resubmission. Apologies for the earlier omission from the package.

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 Request
RR (1/15/2026):

Cleared

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
RR (1/15/2026):

Cleared

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN.A

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN.A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN.A

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN.A

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
Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Thank you for the detailed notes. We see a line titled " Travel for UNIDO backstopping mission to India for PPG quality assurance and executing partner coordination" - per GEF policy and guidelines, travel cost for GEF Agency staff for such work is not eligible to be covered by PPG. As it seems that these costs have not yet been engaged (e.g. planned $3000k but used $0 on the table), it is still time to avoid this expenditure and remove these $3000k from the PPG budget - however in case these costs have already occurred, please ensure to return the corresponding amount to the GEF Trust fund per applicable procedures.

RR (1/15/2026):

1. The PPG table is not in line with guidelines. Thank you for revising with itemized status in line with guidelines. Each line should clarify the purpose of the funding used; e.g. Travel for which activity, national and international consultants to perform which action - and the entire scope should be described to allow assessment of consistency with guidelines. Please note CEO ER document formulation itself is covered by Agency fee, while underlying assessments only are covered under PPG. Other direct costs is not an eligible item - please clarify what is covered in this category.

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. The PPG budget table has been revised for full itemization, expanding from 4 generic lines to 12 activity?specific entries, each describing purpose, scope, geographic coverage and deliverables. The ?Development of CEO Endorsement Document? item has been removed from contractual services (CEO ER formulation covered under Agency fee), and the USD 100,000 contractual services allocation is now distributed across five eligible PPG contracts: baseline energy assessments (USD 40,000), stakeholder engagement (USD 25,000), two HACT micro?assessments (USD 10,000 each) and co?financing mobilization (USD 15,000). The previous USD 2,000 ?Other Direct Costs? line has been reclassified as ?Workshops and Meetings? to cover the PPG inception workshop and stakeholder validation meeting, in line with eligible PPG expenditure categories. A status column has been added so that completion and commitments can be clearly tracked, and overall PPG totals remain unchanged (USD 150,000, with USD 96,192 spent and USD 53,808 committed), with only internal redistribution between categories.

UNIDO (13/5/2026):

1. Travel for UNIDO backstopping mission to India for PPG quality assurance and executing partner coordination removed and adjusted.

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
RR (1/15/2026):

Cleared

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
Cleared

RR (6/16/2026):

Noting that the respective contributions from co-financiers and GEF investments in the cluster pilots is unclear. Please ensure at MTR when reporting materialized co-financing to avoid double counting.

RR (6/3/2026)

1. Cleared

- UNIDO - letter provided - cleared

- MoMSME - letter provided - per the description in the letter, it appears that a good share of the co-financing is rather under the form of grant ("alignment of existing MSME support schemes as per extant provision") - which makes sense as 5.4M$ of in-kind recurrent expenditures (e.g. for staff time) was too high to be realistic. At MTR stage, please disaggregate based on updated values, what corresponds to grant, and what corresponds to recurrent expenditures.

- SIDBI - removed

2. This was not addressed. There is no clarity as to what this co-financing covers in practice and how it relates to the project - it is categorized as grant, but is not a grant and would be a better fit in the "other" category.

RR (5/26/2026):

1. This has still not been addressed. No co-financing letter for SIDBI, Ministry of MSME, and UNIDO (see below).

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount($)	Upload letters of co-finance
Private Sector	Bidar District Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Industries Association	Grant	Investment mobilized	10,240,000.00	
Private Sector	U.P. Paper Mills Association	Grant	Investment mobilized	18,072,289.00	
Private Sector	South Gujarat Textile Processors Association	Grant	Investment mobilized	7,200,000.00	
Private Sector	Bharatiya Cha Parishad (Assam Tea Cluster)	Grant	Investment mobilized	5,000,000.00	
Private Sector	Ankleshwar Industries Association	Grant	Investment mobilized	10,240,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of MSME	In-kind		5,400,000.00	
GEF Agency	UNIDO	Grant	Investment mobilized	107,711.00	
			Total Co-financing($)	56,260,000.00	

2. Thank you for the clarifications

•Bidar District Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Industries Association - (i) It seems from the provided annex that what is supported is not grant for the preparation of feasibility studies as noted before and in the letter, but private capital investment for own benefit related to pilot implementation - please recategorize as "Other" instead of grant, (ii) the explanation refers to technology investment unitary costs as basis for calculation - is our understanding correct that this means pilot technology investments for this cluster are fully covered by co-financing?
•Ankleshwar Industries Association : same comment
•U.P. Paper Mills Association : same comment
•South Gujarat Textile Processors Association : same comment
•Bharatiya Cha Parishad : same comment

RR (5/4/2026):

1. This has not been addressed. Still no co-financing letter for the three below co-financiers and the corresponding text under the table is still misaligned with GEF policy/guidelines. This cannot be postponed to implementation. Either these co-financing letters are available and the co-financing can remain or the table, or they are not and they must be removed from the table, with Agency seeking alternatives to ensure strong co-financing.

2. Please update the text under the co-financing table to reflect these clarifications as it still reflects the previous categorization.

In addition some of the initial comments are still not addressed:

- Bidar District Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Industries Association: (ii) $10.24M seems high for the preparation of feasibility studies - please clarify in more details what is entailed by this 10.24 contribution and why it reaches this level,

- U.P. Paper Mills Association : (ii) please clarify in more details what types of technology investments are entailed by this $18M contribution and why it reaches this specific amount,

- South Gujarat Textile Processors Association : same comments as for the U.P. Paper Mills Association, for the amount of $7.2M

- Bharatiya Cha Parishad (Assam Tea Cluster): same comments as for the U.P. Paper Mills Association, for the amount of $5M

- Ankleshwar Industries Association : (i) please revise the title in the table for consistency, as it currently only displays "Industry association", (ii) same other comments as for the U.P. Paper Mills Association, for the amount of $10.24M

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Letters of co-financing missing for the following co-financiers, thank you for submitting, in a format aligned with guidelines. This cannot be postponed to implementation. Either these co-financing letters are available and the co-financing can remain or the table, or they are not and they must be removed from the table, with Agency seeking alternatives to ensure strong co-financing.

- SIDBI

- UNIDO

- Ministry of MSME

2. For the following letter, please see requests for clarifications - which may require an updated letter in some cases, and a revision of the table for consistency

- Bidar District Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Industries Association: the letter refers to making a $10.24M contribution under the form of "feasibility of the identified solutions" > (i) this seems to correspond to feasibility studies, which would correspond to grant, not equity, (ii) $10.24M seems high for the preparation of feasibility studies - please clarify in more details what is entailed by this 10.24 contribution and why it reaches this level, (iii) the time-frame of the contribution is missing.

- U.P. Paper Mills Association : (i) the time frame is missing, (ii) please clarify in more details what types of technology investments are entailed by this $18M contribution and why it reaches this specific amount, (iii) the co-financing is categorized as equity - but for this to be the case, there would need to be a transfer of ownership from the co-financiers to project beneficiaries/executing partners, which does not seem to be the case here. It looks here more like a grant investment. Thank you for revising the category on the table for consistency.

- South Gujarat Textile Processors Association : same comments as for the U.P. Paper Mills Association, for the amount of $7.2M

- Bharatiya Cha Parishad (Assam Tea Cluster): same comments as for the U.P. Paper Mills Association, for the amount of $5M

- Ankleshwar Industries Association : (i) please revise the title in the table for consistency, as it currently only displays "Industry association", (ii) same other comments as for the U.P. Paper Mills Association, for the amount of $10.24M

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

1. UNIDO co-financing totals USD 911,539, comprising USD 182,308 in cash contributions (digital platform hosting, knowledge management systems, and technical publications) and USD 729,231 in in-kind contributions (CTA and international expert time, Vienna HQ backstopping, and access to UNIDO global knowledge networks). The co-financing table has been updated accordingly.

2. All five industry association contributions have been reclassified from equity to investment mobilized, with revised templates specifying time frames (2027?2033) and technology investment descriptions; total co?financing of USD 50.75 million is distributed across

•Bidar District Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Industries Association (USD 10.2 million)
•U.P. Paper Mills Association (USD 18.1 million), South Gujarat Textile Processors Association (USD 7.2 million)
•Bharatiya Cha Parishad ? Assam Tea Cluster (USD 5 million)
•Ankleshwar Industries Association (USD 10.2 million), and updated letters are now pending signature from all five associations.

UNIDO (13/5/2026)

A new Annex B-1 (?Investment-Mobilized Co-financing: Technology Scope and Unit Economics?) has been added to clarify the five industry-association co-financing commitments. The annex provides additional detail on the technology scope, deployment assumptions, MSME-unit coverage, benchmark capex ranges, per-unit investment estimates, and rationale underpinning the respective co-financing amounts. The title for ?Ankleshwar Industries Association? has also been revised for consistency in the co-financing table.

29.05 UNIDO

Addressed, co-financing letters have been provided

UNIDO (6/11/2026)

2. The five industry association lines have been reclassified in the confirmed Co-financing Table from Grant to Other (Industry Investment)

•**Bidar District Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Industries Association**: Cluster-level pilot demonstrations of EE-RE measures in chemical/ pharmaceutical MSMEs technology deployment and feasibility studies at the Bidar cluster.
•**Ankleshwar Industries Association**: Cluster level pilot demonstrations of waste heat recovery, process-steam efficiency and adoption of best available technologies in the Ankleshwar chemical cluster.
•**U.P Paper Mills Association:** Cluster-level pilot demonstrations of energy-efficient pulping, evaporator upgrades and RE-bundled steam and power solutions in U.P. paper sector clusters.
•**South Gujarat Textile Processors Association**: Cluster-level pilot demonstrations of thermal energy upgrades, dye-house energy efficiency and solar process heat in the South Gujarat textile-processing cluster.
•**Bharatiya Cha Parishad:** Cluster-level pilot demonstrations of biomass/ RE-fired drying and withering systems and plantation to factory energy management in the tea industry cluster.

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 RequestCleared

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN.A

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 RequestCleared

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 Request
RR (1/15/2026):

Please see comments made in the core indicator section and revise as needed

Agency Response

UNIDO (02/25/2026):

The results framework has been fully revised, with updated core indicators and clearer milestones across 5 components and 17 outputs. CI?6 now reports 8.61 MtCO?e direct and 2.67 MtCO?e indirect emission reductions, CI?1 reports 90,912 TJ of energy savings (equivalent to 2.171 Mtoe), and CI?11 reports 4,600 beneficiaries.

Energy savings are reported in MJ, with 90,912 TJ (2.171 Mtoe) used as the primary unit. A 20% attribution factor has been applied to indirect GHG reductions (2.67 MtCO?e post?attribution, down from 13.34 MtCO?e gross). The direct GHG target has been revised from 5.46 to 8.61 MtCO?e using a 28.2% weighted average efficiency improvement (differentiated 35%/28%), and Annex P has been revised accordingly (February 2026). The CI?6.1 start year of accounting has been set to 2028 (Year 2 ? first pilot commissioning). Sex?disaggregated targets have been integrated for CI?11 and for Outputs 2.1.1?2.1.4, 3.1.3 and 4.1.1, in line with the GAP.

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 Request

Cleared

RR (1/15/2026):

Cleared

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

cleared

RR (6/16/2026)

cleared - pending final policy review

RR (6/10/2026)

a. Budget table: please follow the budget table template as specified in the GEF Guidelines, i.e. using the defined expenditure categories (e.g. contractual services to company, contractual services to individuals, operating costs, etc?) and grouping activities under each category as relevant. When resubmitted, we will review the budget table again and provide comments if appropriate.

1. Noted - pending final policy review

RR (5/4/2026):

1. based on revised budget, it appears that several lines are to be executed by UNIDO, which is not consistent with the project institutional arrangements - no exception has been requested nor approved for UNIDO to perform execution roles. Please revise accordingly, the following lines:

Services	Annual financial audits (6 years)	0	0	0	0	0	2
Services	O5.1.2: Periodic Monitoring & GEB Tracking	0	0	0	0	133,000	

2 to 5. Noted - pending final policy-level review

RR (1/15/2026):

Please see below issues with the budget

1. The column ?Responsible Entity? for each budget line lacks precise information ? this is expected at CEO ER stage - thank you for using the template included in Annex 7 of the Guidelines? the categories and the formatting (including the subtotals) must be exactly followed. thank you for sharing this comment to the GEF coordination unit of UNIDO, as this comment is a recurrent one.

2. Contracts for multiple outputs are all lumped into merged lines. Please disaggregate the contracts corresponding to various outputs and activities so we may assess the budget repartition.

3. The project coordinator is charged to both PMC and components.

4. Please see comments on gender above - could you please clarify how the gender action plan is budgeted/where in the budget these actions are covered?

5. Could you please present specific details on the significant budget allocated to ?Travel? ($540,000).

Agency Response
UNIDO (02/25/2026):
1. Annex G budget updated with ?Responsible Entity? completed for each budget line and categories, formatting and subtotals exactly following the template.

2. Contracts for multiple outputs disaggregated into 33 output?level lines so the budget repartition by outputs and activities is clear.

3. Project coordinator budget of USD 350,000 moved exclusively to PMC (total PMC: USD 603,420).

4. Gender Action Plan coverage clarified through 14 GAP?flagged outputs in the budget.

5. Travel budget detailed in a dedicated breakdown sheet (USD 400,000), with the overall budget presented across three sheets and a grand total of USD 8,982,420.

UNIDO (13/5/2026):
1. Budget table updated with certain execution activity by UNIDO removed.

UNIDO (6/11/2026):
Annex G (Budget Table) updated in line with GEF defined expenditure categories - Contractual Services (Companies); Contractual Services (Individuals); Travel: Workshop's and Meetings; Equipment; Operating Costs; Monitoring and Evaluation and grouping activities under each category with cross references back to the output and component.

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
RR (6/16/2026)

Project recommended for approval

RR (6/10/2026)

Sent to Agency for addressing remaining comments and resubmission

RR (5/26/2026):

Thank you for addressing remaining 3 comments (rationale, description and co-financing) and resubmitting

RR (5/4/2026):

1. Thank you for addressing comments and resubmitting - could you please highlight changes made in a different color (other than yellow) for ease of tracking for the rest of the review?

RR (1/15/2026):

1. Thank you for addressing comments and resubmitting - could you please highlight changes made in yellow for ease of tracking for the rest of the review?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request See comments above, including on co-financing

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**1/15/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**5/4/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**5/26/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**6/3/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**6/16/2026**	