



Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in start-ups and SMEs in Indonesia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10459

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in start-ups and SMEs in Indonesia

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

5/13/2022

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

6/29/2021 MY:

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

10/14/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

The GEF PPO unit made the following comments on the project. Please address them and revise the project document package accordingly:

1. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10.0%, for a co-financing of \$16,807,272 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,680,727 instead of \$1,263,271 (which is 8%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion:

	Sub Total (\$)	1,614,986.00	16,807,272.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Sub Total(\$)	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,776,484.00	18,070,543.00
	Sub Total (\$)	1,614,986.00	16,807,272.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Sub Total(\$)	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,776,484.00	18,070,543.00

2. Difference between budget table in Annex E in Portal and Table B under outcome 2.3 and 3.1 ? in Budget table Outcome 2.3 amounts to \$102,060 and Outcome 3.1 amounts to 92,740 :

YEARS 1-5 TOTAL	Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2	Sub-total	M&E	PMC	TOTAL
Outcomes	992,505	107,020	269,660	102,060	92,740	6,000				
Components	992,505			478,740		98,740	1,569,985	45,000	161,499	1,776,484

However, table B in the Portal entry shows a budget of \$164,460 under outcome 2.3 while \$30,341 under outcome 3.1. Please amend it.

- 3. On co-financing:
- 3.1 On the co-financing from BPPT, it is not possible to corroborate if the Investment Mobilized is an actual Grant, Loan, Equity, Guarantee or Public Investment.

Available budget allocation for these related activities, considered as Investment Mobilized, is equal to USD 4.500.000 (Four million five hundred thousand US dollars) within 5 years. In addition, in-kind support is equal to USD 1.400.000 (One million four hundred thousand US dollars) within 5 years.

Recipient Country Government	Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT)	Grant	Investment mobilized	4,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,400,000.00

3.2 Same comment applies to the co-financing from SociopreneurID. In addition, by looking at the website this source should not be categorized as *Private Sector* but rather as *Other*

In regard to your letter dated August 14, 2020 on the support for the program "Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia" I am pleased to confirm that [SociopreneurID – Sociopreneur Hub Indonesia] has some program of [Empathy Project (Including BYTe – Bootcamp For Young Technopreneur, YOURS Camp and FeSoVity – Festival Of Social Creativity), Virtual Lab and 1000 University Changemakers] that related to Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD 838,272 (Eight Hundred Thirty-Eight Thousand Two Hundred Seventy-Two) within 5 years.

Private Sector	SociopreneurID	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	838,272.00
----------------	----------------	---------	------------------------	------------



HOME ABOUT OUR WORKS NEWS CONTACT



Our Story

In 2013, we were established as a university club called Technopreneurship for Youth focusing on improving creativity and innovation skills for children and youth. By 2015, the club started to provide platforms for innovative ideas by connecting specific needs of stakeholders such as government and business. The club continued to grow until it transformed into a social enterprise in early 2018, now focusing on social innovation and entrepreneurship education. It has then officially registered as Sociopreneur Indonesia (SociopreneurID).

3.3 Actually the same comment applies to Buliso Properti Cendekia, Nexus Indosenia, Directorate of Application and Digital Economy Governance Kemenparekraf and Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (Kemen PPPA). Co-financing letters should provide information on the type of co-financing (in-kind, grant, loan, public investment, etc..)

In regard to our meeting on August 18th 2020 on the support for the program "Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia" I am pleased to confirm that PT. Bulisu Properti Cendekia has a program which is Development of Clean Technology-Based Housing that related to Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD 5.434.000 (Five Million Four Hundred Thirty Four Thousand) within 3 years

in Indonesia.

Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD 2 million (two million US dollars) within 3 years.

Transformation Digital, Interactive Virtual Lab that related to Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD Three Hundred and Ninety Thousand within 3 years.

Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD eight hundred eight thousand two hundred seventy one point thirty one (808,271.31) from 2021 to 2024.

3.4 Bakrie Center Foundation: Details of each kind of co-financing should be stipulated in the letter and reflected in Table C. Also the Foundation should be categorized as other rather than Private Sector.

and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation (in combination of cash, grants, and in-kind) for this activity will be equivalent to USD 2,500,000 (Two Million and Five Hundred Thousand Dollars) within 5 years.

Thank you for your attention and cooperation

Private Sector	Bakrie Centre Foundation	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,500,000.00	
----------------	--------------------------	---------	------------------------	--------------	--

5/12/2022 MY:

Not completed at this time.

For comment 3.1, per the response from UNIDO, it is impossible to get a new co-financing letter from the BPPT to justify or re-confirm the type of the co-financing as "investment mobilized" before the deadline of the CEO approval for the project. The GEF does not want the project to be cancelled due to the lack of the new co-financing letter. Please change the type of BPPT co-financing from "investment mobilized" to "in-kind", revise all relevant components and places in the project document accordingly, and re-submit the project. Then, the PM will try to proceed it.

In the meantime, please continue working with the BPPT and the OFP to get a new co-financing letter to justify or confirm that the \$4.5 million co-financing from the BPPT is "investment mobilized". Please confirm UNIDO's commitment to working on new co-financing letter in the response to this comment.

5/13/2022 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed.

Regarding the PPO's comment 3a, UNIDO promised to continue working with the BPPT and the OFP to get a new co-financing letter to justify that the \$4.5 million co-financing is "investment mobilized".

Agency Response

17-Dec-21

The project is being resubmitted to be able to upload the Request for extension invoking force majeure. Please return the project so we can address the remaining comments.

Thank you.

11 May 2022

1. The co-finance figures were amended to make the consistency in the PMC proportionality at 10%. Accordingly, the figures are as below:

	GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Project component 1.-3.	1,614,986	16,427,772
PMC	161,498	1,642,771
Total	1,776,484	18,070,543

2. The figures under Table B and Annex E were amended to match each other. In addition, the M&E (to be included under 3.2) was slightly increased for Midterm review and terminal evaluation (at USD15,000). The revised figures are below:

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	M&E	PMC	Grand Total
Grand Total	992,505	463,741	92,740	66,000	161,498	1,776,484

The revised Annex E Budget as of 11 May 2022 is attached.

3.1 When it comes to the BPPT co-financing letter, based on the BPPT's mandate of ?Monitoring, coaching and service to the activities of government and private agencies in the field of assessment and application of technology in the framework of innovation, diffusion, and capacity building, as well as fostering technology transfer? (<https://www.bppt.go.id/tugas-dan-fungsi>), it was confirmed that the investment mobilized by BPPT is in the form of a research grant.

However, the revision of the BPPT co-financing letter turned out to be difficult due to the unforeseen circumstances where BPPT was merged into another government agency, BRIN (National Research and Innovation Agency), together with other national R&D related agencies, as per Presidential Decree No. 33/2021. BRIN gained official cabinet level status in August 2021 according to Presidential Decree No. 78/2021 but it is still in transition phase. It was confirmed by BRIN, as well as the GEF OFP in Indonesia, that BRIN directly succeeds to all the BPPT functions and will eventually assume the roles of BPPT in this project. BRIN will issue the co-financing letter under its name once the transition is completed. For the time being, BRIN communicated that the internal coordination within BRIN needs more time while they are keen to support the project, which was also strongly supported by the GEF OFP in Indonesia.

For better understanding of the circumstances, UNIDO would like to propose to have a conference call with the GEF PM and PPO team.

3.2 The co-financing letters of Nexus Indonesia and SociopreneurID were revised and attached. The category of SociopreneurID was revised to 'Other'.

The co-financing letters of Buliso Properti Cendekia, Directorate of Application and Digital Economy Governance Kemenparekraf, Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (Kemen PPPA) and Bakrie Center Foundation mention that there are relevant projects meaning that those are regarded as in-kind recurrent expenditures in parallel to the project. The category of Bakrie Center Foundation was revised to 'Other'.

In addition, the paragraph under Table C was revised as below:

With regards to 'Investment Mobilized', it was agreed as follows:

During project preparation, extensive consultations were carried out with Indonesian government stakeholders, industry associations, entrepreneurs, SMEs, Start-up Assistance Organizations (SAOs), organizations promoting gender equality and the economic empowerment of women (GEEW) and other entities involved in the cleantech space. Consultations identified many synergies between existing national and international programmes and the Indonesian GCIP child project co-financing modalities were discussed with interested entities prior to and during the project preparation phase.

With regards to 'Investment Mobilized', it was agreed as follows:

(a) the Project Executing Entity, BPPT, will mobilize a grant amount of USD 4,500,000 for accelerating innovative solutions identified through the project; (b) UNIDO will provide USD 50,000 in the form of a grant. Moreover, (c) additional investment will be mobilized through the accelerator as direct investment in successful accelerator participants companies and technologies supported through extensive advocacy and outreach activities organized under output 1.1.6 and investment mobilized through output 1.1.7.

The GEF grant is focused on supporting the formative stages of cleantech enterprises, i.e. prototyping, proof of concept, ecosystems building. Co-financing from the public sector (predominantly in-kind) creates the enabling framework conditions that de-risk the key interventions by the GCIP project. As was already confirmed by the findings of the Independent Evaluation of the previous GCIP cycles, co-financing in the form of grants, seed funding, equity from angels, venture capital funds, impact investors, crowd

funding platforms etc. will be mobilized during the implementation of the project from the private sector in the phases of development, growth and scale-up of the start-ups/SMEs. In line with GEF Guidelines on Co-financing (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/co-financing>), paragraph 9, co-financing that will be mobilized from the private sector during the implementation of the project will be monitored and reported through the regular reporting mechanisms to the GEF.

Unlike in the case of demonstration projects for example, the project contributes to market creation for new innovative cleantech products and services. It de-risks, by design, cleantech innovations and businesses through coaching, mentoring and advisory services thereby creating opportunities for follow-on investments into the cleantech companies in terms of angel investors, dedicated cleantech funds (private and public), venture capital funds (corporate and otherwise), impact investors etc. Therefore, the follow-on investments will be realised once the specific cleantech companies have been supported by the project and linked to investors.

Under the umbrella project of GCIP, project 10461, a strategic partnership will be established between GCIP and the Private Financing Advisory Network - PFAN (www.pfan.net), under which GCIP alumni companies will be systematically connected to PFAN for specialized project development, business coaching and investment facilitation services and introduction to existing network of global investors, hence mobilize co-financing. Furthermore, in countries where PFAN operates, GCIP activities will be linked to PFAN network of expertise and national investors. This is one example of where investment co-financing will likely be mobilized during project implementation.

Apart from the planned investment mobilized at the CEO Approval stage, it is important to underline that GCIP participants may receive substantial investment support at a later stage. There are several examples that confirm this process. Under GEF 5 the GCIP India project from 2013-2017, co-financing planned was 3,000,000 USD at CEO Approval stage, consisting out of 450,000 USD investment mobilized and the remaining amount as in-kind[1]. However, GCIP companies such as Agnisumukh and Atomberg managed to mobilize 2,650,000 USD and 10,000,000 USD respectively in investments within four years of completing the GCIP accelerator, thereby reaching a ratio of 1:13 in GEF funding to investment mobilized. Similarly in the project GCIP Malaysia, investment co-financing at CEO Approval stage encompassed 250,000 USD, while it was subsequently reported in the project's terminal evaluation that 2,000,000 USD was received by GCIP alumni in form of investment grants by financial organizations, signaling higher involvement and interest by the latter than initially anticipated[2]. In

GCIP Turkey, investment mobilized at CEO Approval stage amounted to 250,000 USD, whereas GCIP finalists, such as Positive Energy and Epissime Biotech managed to mobilize 1,620,000 USD and 1,700,000 USD respectively, thereby having successfully raised funding from private sector investment groups.[3] These examples are intended to serve as an excerpt for the successful promotion of GCIP award winning cleantech innovations and their potential to attract follow-on investment from the private sector within the project's lifetime and beyond. GCIP India supported 89 companies, in Malaysia 79 companies and 95 in Turkey; the co-financing ratio will increase as more GCIP companies commercialise and the current project will provide a greater level of support to companies compared to the previous GCIP country projects under GEF 5&6 including investment facilitation.

[1] 2018, Independent Terminal Evaluation: GEF-UNIDO Cleantech programme for small and medium

enterprises in India, https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/files/2018-09/120345%20GEF%20UNIDO%20Cleantech%20Programme%20for%20SMEs%20in%20India_0.pdf

[2] 2018, Independent Terminal Evaluation: GEF-UNIDO Cleantech programme for SMEs in Malaysia, https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/files/2018-04/Cleantech%20Malaysia_120096_TE_Final%20report.pdf

[3] 2018, Independent Terminal Evaluation: GEF UNIDO Cleantech Programme for SMEs in Turkey, https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/files/2018-12/GEF%20ID-5505_GFTUR-130124_TE-2017.pdf

13 May 2022

Thank you very much for your kind consideration. The type of BPPT co-financing was changed to in-kind and the narrative below the co-financing table was revised. UNIDO is fully committed to work on securing new co-financing letter to justify or confirm that USD 4.5 million as investment mobilized.

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

6/29/2021 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/participants of the project. If data is available, please elaborate the percentage of women and girls in the project beneficiaries/participants in Table B and in the project document.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 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

6/29/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

1. Not all amounts and types in Table C are consistent with the amounts and types in the co-financing letters. Please revise the CEO AR package accordingly.

2. The part of "investment mobilized" in the total co-financing is too small. Please raise this part so that the ratio of GEF grant vs investment mobilized can reach 1:5 which is required by the GEF Council for a country like Indonesia in GEF7.

9/16/2021 PM:

No. There seems to be a mistake in the paragraph below (taken from the section right below Table C "Sources of Co-financing for hte Project by name and by type"). Specifically, the resources to be provided by Bakrie, Nexus are not investment mobilized but recurrent expenses. Also some of the figures are not correct, for instance Bakrie shall be UDS 2,500,000 instead of UDS 2,000,000. There are other few inconsistencies in the paragraph. Please revise and update accordingly.

"With regards to **?Investment Mobilized?**, it was agreed as follows: (a) the Project Executing Entity, BPPT, will mobilize a grant amount of USD 3,000,000 for accelerating innovative solutions identified through the project. (b) The Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection agreed to support this project, in particular the activities that promote GEEW in the project activity through its grant of USD 808,271. (c) Nexus Indonesia will provide, through its program, support to renewable energy start-ups in the form of grant at the amount of USD 2,000,000. (d) Bakrie Centre Foundation will provide USD 2,000,000 especially for supporting innovations related to circular economy aligned with its **program**".

9/29/2021 PM:

Cleared.

Agency Response
23 Aug. 2021

1. The table C has been revised and the revised co-financing letter by BPPT was attached.
2. Description was added under the co-financing table.

22 Sep, 2021

The paragraph was revised as below:

With regards to **?Investment Mobilized?**, it was agreed as follows:

(a) the Project Executing Entity, BPPT, will mobilize a grant amount of USD 4,500,000 for accelerating innovative solutions identified through the project; (b) UNIDO will provide USD 50,000 in the form a grant. Moreover, (c) additional investment will be mobilised through the accelerator as direct investment in successful accelerator participants companies and technologies supported through extensive advocacy and outreach activities organized under output 1.1.6 and investment mobilized through output 1.1.7.

With regards to **?recurrent expenditures?**, it was agreed as follows:

(d) BPPT, will mobilize in-kind support for project execution at the amount of USD 1,400,000; (e) UNIDO will provide in-kind contribution at the amount of US\$150,000; (f) SociopreneurID will provide USD 838,272 in the form of in-kind contribution through its support services; (g) PT Buliso Properti Cendikia will provide USD 5,434,000 in the form of in-kind contribution through its support services; (h) Nexus Indonesia will provide USD 2,000,000 in the form of in-kind contribution through its program for supporting renewable energy start-ups; (i) Bakrie Centre Foundation will provide USD 2,500,000 in the form of in-kind contribution especially for supporting innovations related to circular economy; (j) Directorate of Application and Digital Economy Governance Kemenparekraf will provide USD 390,000 in the form of in-kind contribution; and (k) The Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (Kemen PPPA) will provide USD 808,271 in the form of in-kind contribution in particular for the activities that promote GEEW in the project activity.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

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

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 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

6/29/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please fill the missing information in Indicator 6.3.

9/16/2021 PM:

Cleared.

Agency Response

23 Aug. 2021

The project may be able to report on core indicators 6.3 and 6.4 depending on the types of technologies selected to receive support from the project. Please note that the exact technology categories of the Accelerator will be determined during the review and adaptation of the GCIP guidebooks for Indonesia, and therefore it is not possible at this point in time to set a target for energy saved and increase in installed capacity.

The screening criteria for selection of cleantech start-ups into the Accelerator, as well as advanced and post acceleration services will comprehensively assess the technology/solution's potential for contributing to GEBs . The monitoring and tracking of GEBs achieved (including energy saved and RE installed) will be part of the M&E plan both at the programmatic and project levels, and will be reported through the project's Annual Impact Reports, as well as through the annual PIRs.

The monitoring and reporting of GEBs achieved under this project will be guided by the GCIP Framework, and the M&E plan developed under the GCIP coordination project (GEF project ID 10461). All GCIP child projects, including GCIP Indonesia will adapt the GCIP M&E plan, which provides methodologies and guidelines for tracking and reporting of all GEBs including RE capacity installed and energy saved.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 22-30.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 31-40.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 40-83.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 83-84.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 84-85.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 85-88.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 88-90.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 90-95 and Annex D.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 95-98.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented in Annex J of the CEO AR package.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented in Annex K of the CEO AR package.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 131-132.

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

6/29/2021 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.

9/16/2021 PM:

Cleared.

Agency Response

23 Aug. 2021

Information on climate risk screening was included under the section 5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives.

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

6/29/2021 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 8 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.

9/16/2021 PM:

No. Kindly note Figure 8 "**Relationships between project stakeholders under the framework of coordination**" is too small and cannot be read. Please fix it accordingly.

9/29/2021 PM:

Cleared.

Agency Response

23 Aug. 2021

Figure 8 was revised and the explanation was included on other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination under ?Coordination with other projects and initiatives?.

22 Sep. 2021

The figure was replaced.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes.

As shown on pages 140-143, 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

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 143-145.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is presented on pages 145-146.

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

6/29/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

On page 146-147, please also elaborate how these socioeconomic benefits will translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits (in a quantitative way to show the results).

9/16/2021 PM:

Cleared.

Agency Response

23 Aug. 2021

Section 10. Benefits was further elaborated to include socioeconomic benefits as a result of supporting and introducing new cleaner technologies into the market, strengthening national institutional capabilities, enhancing the availability of financial instruments, and encouraging inclusivity in the entrepreneurial and job markets.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. All Annexes are attached to the CEO AR package

9/16/2021 PM:

No. While the budget has been added to the CEO Approval Document under Annex E: Project Budget Table, in this this version of the budget is not possible to analyze which items (consultants, travel, etc.) are going to be paid from which sources (Project?s components, M&E, PMC). Please add a more detailed version which specifies the items as well as the sources.

9/29/2021 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. M&E budget in table under Section 9 of the GEF CEO Document is US\$ 45,000, while the M&E budget in Annex E is US\$ 60,000. Please update these numbers to make them consistent.

2. When project staff is charged to both ?PMC and project?s components? (as it is the case for this project: the National Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant are charged to both), per Guidelines ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat? (see paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). Please EITHER provide clear Term of Reference for the National Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant describing unique outputs linked to the respective components OR charge National Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant cost only to PMC (both the GEF and the co-financing portion).

10/8/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the project document was revised.

Agency Response

22 Sep 2021

The budget table was revised.

05 Oct 2021

1. A new budget table (Annex E as of 23 Sep) has been uploaded. The total budget for M&E in the Annex E is USD 45,000 which corresponds to the M&E budget table in section 9 of the GEF CEO endorsement document.

2. Please find the attached ToRs for National Project Technical Expert and Coordinator and the Project Assistant.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. It is attached in Annex A.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. The responses to Council comments are presented in Annex B.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

Yes. The responses to STAP comments are presented in Annex B.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/29/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/29/2021 MY:
Yes. It is presented in Annex C.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/29/2021 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
6/29/2021 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

6/29/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/29/2021 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

6/29/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Please address the above comments and revise the CEO AR package accordingly.

9/16/2021 PM:

No. Please address comments above on co-financing, Figure 8 (currently not readable) and budget table.

9/29/2021 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. M&E budget in table under Section 9 of the GEF CEO Document is US\$ 45,000, while the M&E budget in Annex E is US\$ 60,000. Please update these numbers to make them consistent.

2. When project staff is charged to both ?PMC and project?s components? (as it is the case for this project: the National Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant are charged to both), per Guidelines ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique

outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat? (see paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). Please EITHER provide clear Term of Reference for the National Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant describing unique outputs linked to the respective components OR charge National Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant cost only to PMC (both the GEF and the co-financing portion).

10/8/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the project document was revised. The PM recommends technical clearance for this project.

10/14/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

The GEF PPO unit made the following comments on the project. Please address them and revise the project document package accordingly:

1. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10.0%, for a co-financing of \$16,807,272 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,680,727 instead of \$1,263,271 (which is 8%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion:

	Sub Total (\$)	1,614,985.00	16,807,272.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Sub Total(\$)	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,776,484.00	18,070,543.00
	Sub Total (\$)	1,614,985.00	16,807,272.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Sub Total(\$)	161,498.00	1,263,271.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,776,484.00	18,070,543.00

2. Difference between budget table in Annex E in Portal and Table B under outcome 2.3 and 3.1 ? in Budget table Outcome 2.3 amounts to \$102,060 and Outcome 3.1 amounts to 92,740 :

YEARS 1-5 TOTAL	Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2	Sub-total	M&E	PMC	TOTAL
Outcomes	992,505	107,020	269,660	102,060	92,740	6,000				
Components	992,505			478,740		98,740	1,569,985	45,000	161,499	1,776,484

However, table B in the Portal entry shows a budget of **\$164,460** under outcome 2.3 while **\$30,341** under outcome 3.1. Please amend it.

- 3. On co-financing:
- 3.1 On the co-financing from BPPT, it is not possible to corroborate if the Investment Mobilized is an actual Grant, Loan, Equity, Guarantee or Public Investment.

Available budget allocation for these related activities, considered as Investment Mobilized, is equal to USD 4,500,000 (Four million five hundred thousand US dollars) within 5 years. In addition, in-kind support is equal to USD 1,400,000 (One million four hundred thousand US dollars) within 5 years.

Recipient Country Government	Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT)	Grant	Investment mobilized	4,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,400,000.00

- 3.2 Same comment applies to the co-financing from SociopreneurID. In addition, by looking at the website this source should not be categorized as *Private Sector* but rather as *Other*

In regard to your letter dated August 14, 2020 on the support for the program "Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia" I am pleased to confirm that [SociopreneurID – Sociopreneur Hub Indonesia] has some program of [Empathy Project (Including BYTe – Bootcamp For Young Technopreneur, YOURS Camp and FeSoVity – Festival Of Social Creativity), Virtual Lab and 1000 University Changemakers] that related to Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD **838,272 (Eight Hundred Thirty-Eight Thousand Two Hundred Seventy-Two)** within 5 years.

Private Sector	SociopreneurID	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	838,272.00
----------------	----------------	---------	------------------------	------------



HOME ABOUT OUR WORKS NEWS CONTACT



Our Story

In 2013, we were established as a university club called Technopreneurship for Youth focusing on improving creativity and innovation skills for children and youth. By 2015, the club started to provide platforms for innovative ideas by connecting specific needs of stakeholders such as government and business. The club continued to grow until it transformed into a social enterprise in early 2018, now focusing on social innovation and entrepreneurship education. It has then officially registered as Sociopreneur Indonesia (SociopreneurID).

- 3.3 Actually the same comment applies to Buliso Properti Cendekia, Nexus Indosenia, Directorate of Application and Digital Economy Governance Kemenparekraf and

Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (Kemen PPPA). Co-financing letters should provide information on the type of co-financing (in-kind, grant, loan, public investment, etc..)

In regard to our meeting on August 18th 2020 on the support for the program "Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia" I am pleased to confirm that PT. Bulisu Properti Cendikia has a program which is Development of Clean Technology-Based Housing that related to Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD 5,434,000 (Five Million Four Hundred Thirty Four Thousand) within 3 years

in Indonesia.

Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD 2 million (two million US dollars) within 3 years.

Transformation Digital, Interactive Virtual Tour that related to Global Cleantech Innovation Programme - Accelerating Cleantech Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD Three Hundred and Ninety Thousand within 3 years.

Entrepreneurship in Start-Ups and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation for this activity will be equivalent to USD eight hundred eight thousand two hundred seventy one point thirty one (808,271.31) from 2021 to 2024.

3.4 Bakrie Center Foundation: Details of each kind of co-financing should be stipulated in the letter and reflected in Table C. Also the Foundation should be categorized as other rather than Private Sector.

and SMEs in Indonesia. Budget allocation (in combination of cash, grants, and in-kind) for this activity will be equivalent to USD 2,500,000 (Two Million and Five Hundred Thousand Dollars) within 5 years.

Thank you for your attention and cooperation

Private Sector	Bakrie Centre Foundation	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,500,000.00
----------------	--------------------------	---------	------------------------	--------------

Please address the above comments and put the responses to the box below the first question in the review sheet. Thank you.

5/12/2022 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please address the comment in Box 1.

5/13/2022 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed.

Regarding the PPO's comment 3a, UNIDO promised to continue working with the BPPT and the OFP to get a new co-financing letter to justify that the \$4.5 million co-financing is "investment mobilized".

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/12/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of the project is to support low-carbon economic growth by promoting clean technology innovations and entrepreneurship through a Cleantech innovation platform and accelerator 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. Expected outputs include: (1) Investment mobilized for projects implementation to deploy innovative cleantech solutions across various sectors (minimum 12 enterprises provided with funds); (2) Three (3) cycles of the Annual Cleantech competition-GCIP Indonesia Accelerator are conducted (including National innovation Challenges for clean technology) (at least 27 participants per year); (3) At least two introductory Entrepreneurship training programs per year on business models and innovation for clean technologies organized for women (150 participants) and students (150 participants); (4) Post-accelerator support provided for start-ups and SMEs to access finance and reach market entry (i.e. tipping-point investment facilitation support given for minimum 15 enterprises); (5) National pool of mentors and judges identified, created and trained (at least 40); and (6) Extensive

advocacy and outreach activities organized (13 events in total) at the national and regional level in a gender-responsive manner including: Public private partnership forums held; and knowledge/best practice shared. With \$1.78 million of grant, this project will mobilize a total of more than \$18 million of co-financing from the government. The project aims at mitigating 864,000 tonnes of CO₂e during its lifetime operation.

Possible Impacts of COVID -19 on the project and measures to mitigate the impacts:

The impacts include (1) Technical expertise may not be 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 and services.

Measures to mitigate the impacts include: (1) Necessary efforts will be made to identify alternative technical experts in case it is required; (2) Planning will be flexible enough to reschedule activities onsite that require specific expertise. The capacity of stakeholders, and especially the beneficiaries, for remote-work and online interactions will be strengthened by securing access to commercially available conferencing systems. The current design of the curriculum for entrepreneurs is based on online interactions and deliverables, using webinars and web platforms, and therefore COVID-19 is not expected to pose a significant risk to the conduct of the acceleration cycles; and (3) The situation of losing supports from the national stakeholders will be closely monitored in order to find alternate supporters or co-financiers, or to readjust the list of beneficiaries if needed; and (4) The project team will undertake efforts needed to find alternative providers of goods and services and make sure that competitive pricing is obtained.

Possible Opportunities of COVID -19 on the project:

The opportunities include: (1) New business opportunities created in response to COVID-19 related restrictions and measures. Response to COVID-19 restrictions, such as remote working arrangements and no-contact business modalities will require solutions that can be turned into new business models. These opportunities will be analyzed at the national level and shared with the GCIP Indonesia entrepreneurs. Examples of former GCIP alumni responding to new business opportunities by providing innovative solutions during the pandemic are summarized at: <https://www.unido.org/stories/cleantech-innovators-take-covid-19>. (2) New business opportunities to build back better for business continuity and economic recovery post-COVID-19. By design, the GCIP Indonesia engages private sector to promote and scale up cleantech products and services, and business models with resilience to climate change (e.g., circular business models). Information on relevant new business opportunities as well as policy/regulations will be added to the GCIP Indonesia curriculum so that the entrepreneurs are fully informed of the market and policy trends.