



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5218		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Cleantech Programme for SMEs in India		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$3,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Pradeep Monga

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. Mr. Pande endorsed the project in a letter signed and dated November 7, 2012, in the amount of \$1.1 million inclusive of agency fees.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. UNIDO is leading the GEF initiative to promote innovation and entrepreneurship under the GEF Private Sector Strategy.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		DER, December 12, 2012. There is no non-grant instrument.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	DER, December 12, 2012. NA	DER, December 12, 2012. NA
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. The project supports CCM-1, Technology Transfer
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. The appropriate CCM-1 objectives are identified.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. The National government is expecting that technology innovation will play a critical role in meeting its national targets for energy saving and environmental protection as documented in National Communications and national legislation/regulation.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. With the strong involvement of key ministries and SME stakeholder associations, including FICCI, CII, and ASSOCHAM, plus institutions of higher learning including TERI

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			University, IIT and IIM, there is a high potential for replication.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. The results of the support for innovation in the SME sector is estimated to contribute between 0.5% and 1% of the India plans for emissions reductions, amounting to cumulative 350-700 kton CO2e reductions over 10 years.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. The proposed GEF activities will provide support to catalyze greater innovation by SME in the area of environmentally sound technologies.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		DER, December 12, 2012. The project consists of the following components: 1) National Platform to promote clean technology innovations and competitiveness of SMEs and business models that can deliver global environmental benefits 2) Building national capacity for clean technologies and the development of a supportive local entrepreneurial ecosystem. 3) Policy and institutional framework for scaling up Cleantech competition, innovations and acceleration activities across India.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes, the project use and upper and lower bound to estimate the indirect emissions benefits.
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes, the promotion of women entrepreneurs is identified in the project.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. Industry association, academia, and other stakeholder involvement is clearly described.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA. This is a one-step MSP approval.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA.
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. The request for PMC is \$90,000 which is 9% of the total GEF sub-total of

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing			\$1,000,000.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. During project implementation the executing agency will pursue private sector cost-sharing.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
	• Council comments?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		DER, December 12, 2012. NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		DER, December 12, 2012. Yes. This MSP is technically cleared and ready to be approved.
Review Date (s)	First review*		December 12, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.