

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5218	
GEF Agency project ID		120345	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	
Project name		Cleantech Programme for SMEs in India (GCIP India)	
Country/Countries		India	
Region		SA	
Focal area		Climate change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CCM-1; GEF-5 Modality 3	
Executing agencies involved		UNIDO-based national Programme Management Unit (PMU) (lead executing agency), in partnership with India's Ministry for Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises (MSME) (including IDEMI), Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), Alliance for Energy Efficient Economy (AEEE), and National Research Development Corporation (NRDC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not mentioned	
Private sector involvement		Cleantech Open (CTO) (knowledge partner)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 24, 2013	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 10, 2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 31, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		June 2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		1	1
Co-financing	IA own	.1	Not Available
	Government	2.9	Not Available
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other		
Total GEF funding		1	1
Total Co-financing		3	Not Available
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4	Not Available
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 2018	
Author of TE		Mr. Ronnie MacPherson and Mr. Das, Keshav C Das	
TER completion date		January 28, 2020	
TER prepared by		Meghan Jutras	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		MS	-	ML
M&E Design		MU	-	MS
M&E Implementation		MU	-	MU
Quality of Implementation		HS ¹	-	S
Quality of Execution		HS ²	-	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to develop and promote clean energy technologies through a competition and accelerator programme for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that would lead to a reduction in GHG emissions and contribute to energy savings and sustainable green growth in India. More specifically, the project anticipated that “emissions in the range of 350,000 t CO₂ eq to approximately 700,000 t CO₂ eq will be reduced over a 10 year period.” Given the US\$ 1 million GEF contribution to the project, this would result in “a unit abatement cost (UAC) of US\$ 2.86 per ton of CO₂ and US\$ 1.43 per ton of CO₂ respectively.” (CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012 pg. 10-11)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to strengthen India’s policy and institutional framework, and build national capacity to promote clean energy technology innovations in SMEs through a national cleantech competition and entrepreneurship acceleration programme. (CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012 pg. 21; 2017 PIR pg. 1)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes to the global environmental objectives, development objectives, or activities during implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

¹ UNIDO performance rating (TE pg. 31)

² National counterparts performance rating (TE pg. 31)

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses project relevance to be **Highly Satisfactory**. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**.

The project's objectives are consistent with several objectives under the GEF Focal Area of Climate Change: Objective 1, "promote the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies;" Objective 2, "Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector;" and Objective 3: "Promote investment in renewable energy technologies;" and Objective 4, "Promote energy efficiency, low-carbon transport and urban systems." Of note, the original program document suggested that the project's primary contribution to GEF objectives would be through policy-related outcomes and outputs, but its eventual work on policy was limited. (TE pg. 12)

The project's objectives and activities were also consistent with the Government of India's national priorities. India's Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) identified the issues of energy security and climate change mitigation as priority areas for policy action, and the project supports the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC).

The TE found that the project was also highly relevant to the needs of cleantech innovators working in India. "Its emphasis on market research, business development and financial modelling – as opposed to technology validation or technical development – was particularly valuable for participants. [The project's] thematic focus on cleantech and its support for businesses with capital-intensive, high start-up costs also addressed a gap evident across comparable initiatives." (pg. 10)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE assesses project effectiveness as **Satisfactory**, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project was designed to strengthen India's policy and institutional framework, and build national capacity to promote innovations in clean energy technologies in selected SMEs through an innovation platform and entrepreneurship acceleration program. (CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012 pg. 2) By project end, it was expected that the project would "establish a platform for promoting low carbon entrepreneurship and technologies in SMEs and increase the awareness of the role of clean technology innovations in SMEs for enhancing competitiveness and economic development." (2017 PIR pg. 1-2)

The TE found that the project largely achieved its two main outcomes on entrepreneur development and institutional capacity building. The project's support to entrepreneurs, including mentorship and expanded professional networks, enabled many participants to increase their confidence and develop more robust business models. The majority of the project's work - over 81% - was budgeted to these two outcome areas. Notably, there was limited progress on the policy strengthening and M&E systems, the other two outcome areas. (TE pg. 14) The limits to the M&E systems in particular made it difficult for this TER to assess the results at the project's end in comparison to those expected and outlined under each outcome area in the original project document.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome area, is provided below:

- **Outcome area 1: Clean energy technology innovators identified and supported and becoming clean tech entrepreneurs**

Expected results under this outcome area included: (1) establishment of a national level platform to promote clean technology innovations and entrepreneurship amongst SMEs; and (2) identification, support, and promotion of innovators and entrepreneurs in clean energy technologies. By project end, four annual nationwide cleantech competitions had been held with a total of 93 participants³, and the TE found that nearly all participants surveyed positively assessed the support they had received through the program. (TE pg. 8) They viewed the mentoring component as effective and valuable, while noting a lack of marketing expertise within the mentor pool. Participants also valued networking with other entrepreneurs in the competition and learning from one another, and felt there were opportunities to expand these networks even further. (TE pg. 17)

- **Outcome area 2: Adequate strengthened institutional capacity for successful organization of cleantech competitions and acceleration programs during and beyond the project**

Expected results under this outcome area included: (1) involvement of National Associations of SMEs in capacity building initiatives; (2) development of a mentoring and training program for high-growth SMEs; and (3) establishment of a Cleantech Institution for training of trainers and entrepreneurs, and linking with universities and institutions. The project proactively approached a number of trade associations to discuss coordinating on the platform, and also engaged AEEE, NRDC, FICCI, the Department of Industrial Planning and Promotion (DIPP), and others to support implementation. (2016 PIR) The TE does not explicitly address expected results (2) and (3)⁴, nor were they evident in the project's PIRs. The TE states that participants and experts (including mentors and judges) agreed that day-to-day management of the project was effective, efficient, and continued to improve each year, including during the final year with the PMU handover from UNIDO to IDEMI. However, the TE found that a lack of codified processes during the transition resulted in some procedural errors and tensions behind the scenes, and was

³ This TER calculates the total number of participants by aggregating reports in the 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 PIRs.

⁴ These expected results were articulated in the Jan. 2013 CEO Endorsement, and this TER could not find evidence that they were modified, dropped, or otherwise reported on in any other available documents.

somewhat rushed overall. This is notable given the extended timeline of the project and opportunity for these challenges to be anticipated and mitigated. (TE pg. 18)

- **Outcome area 3: Strengthened policy and regulatory framework to facilitate promotion of clean energy technologies, innovation and entrepreneurship**

The expected result under this outcome area was the strengthening of India's policies and institutional framework (including regulations) to promote cleantech innovations by SMEs. The TE notes that the original program document emphasized this outcome area, which was also expected to be the project's primary contribution to the GEF Climate Change Focal Area. The TE found that "no direct, structured policy work was undertaken by the programme. The lack of policy work is understandable, given the relatively innovative, pilot-based nature of the programme, the very limited resources, and the challenges within any country of influencing national policy (particularly when a programme is relatively low profile and very low budget, as with GCIP India). The programme document's stated policy objectives were clearly over-ambitious and unrealistic." (pg. 19) The TE noted that the project did engage (and potentially influence) policymakers in India, and also had high visibility within India's Ministry of Ministry for Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises MSME, which helped to raise awareness of and support for the project in relevant policy circles. (pg. 20) In addition, the project published a GCIP Journal, with policy-related ideas and lessons largely sourced from program participants and experts. However, the journal was not well formatted to target policymakers and was not intended to influence policy. (TE pg. 20)

- **Outcome area 4: Adequate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place, facilitating smooth and successful project implementation and sound impact**

The expected result under this outcome area was adequate monitoring of all project indicators, and regular evaluations to ensure successful project implementation. The M&E system envisioned for this outcome area was intended to support real-time learning and subsequently improve ongoing program implementation. The TE found that the PMU established the necessary databases for program management and progress reporting, but no systems were established for longer-term monitoring of the project (for example, outcomes achieved by competition participants). The TE noted the existence of "informal, ad hoc monitoring" as the PMU stayed in touch with some participants, but this was not a systematic approach nor sufficient for assessing long-term results. Some stakeholders also expressed concern that the project tended to report only "good news," and not the "bad news" program stories (for example, the failure of GCIP India's 2016 winner) that were equally valuable for transparency and learning. (TE pg. 21)

The TE states, "Strictly speaking then, the existing M&E systems are in line with those planned for within the original programme document." (pg. 20) However, the TE notes that the resources allocated to this outcome area (US\$ 20,000, or 2% of a US\$ 910,000 grant) were insufficient for assessing the contribution of the program beyond its immediate results. This TER also finds additional shortcomings in the M&E system. While the project's theory of change appears sound, the expected results under each outcome area (as articulated in the CEO

Endorsement Jan. 2013) were not reported on in the project's PIRs; monitoring and reporting appears to be limited to output-level indicators. Moreover, the PIRs did not report on this fourth outcome area (*Adequate M&E mechanisms in place*) at all.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses project efficiency as **Highly Satisfactory**, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The TE found that the project's leveraging of extensive pro-bono support was a highly cost-effective approach; this included nearly all of its India-based external expertise, such as mentors, investors, judges, and screening committees. In addition, the project financed four rounds of the annual cleantech competition as opposed to the initially planned three, at no additional cost. (pg. 13-14)

The TE also identifies significant in-kind contributions from MSME, including the time of MSME personnel, office space for the Programme Management Unit (PMU), and hosting several project events. However, while these contributions were significant, it is unlikely that they reached the originally projected value of US\$ 2.5 million. (TE pg. 14)

While the day-to-day management of the project by the PMU was effective and efficient, the TE found that the lack of clearly established processes, roles, and responsibilities during the handover of the PMU from UNIDO to IDEMI in the project's final year caused some procedural errors and internal tensions. (pg. 18) No-cost extensions, totaling 2 years and 3 months⁵, were granted through June 2018 to allow the project to hold the fourth cleantech competition (which concluded in December 2017) and complete the TE in early 2018 (TE pg. vii, 2).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project sustainability. This TER, which uses a different scale, adjusts its rating to **Moderately Likely**.

Financial Resources

This TER assesses the sustainability of financial resources to be **Likely**. The TE found that the program was highly efficient, particularly given the addition of a fourth annual competition within the existing budget. (pg. 12) The leveraged pro-bono support - including mentors, judges, and screening committees - was highly cost effective and "established a strong, potentially self-sustaining operational model for future programs," with several participants offering their support (TE pg. 13) The majority of participants agreed that the low cost, pro-bono model worked well and should continue. (TE pg. 26)

⁵ The TER estimates this time frame from the proposed project end date of March 31, 2016 and the scheduled project end date of June 2018.

Sociopolitical

This TER assesses sociopolitical sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**. The TE found that nearly all stakeholders (including participants, mentors, UNIDO, and MSME) felt that GCIP India should continue and would support a future iteration of the work. The majority agreed that MSME was the most appropriate institution to host the competition long-term, and that UNIDO should continue to be involved in some capacity given their networks, technical expertise, and value-add of their brand. (TE pg. 26) However, the TE states that “many stakeholders identified the lack of formal, systematic post-competition engagement as an important shortcoming with the programme’s design, potentially compromising the sustainability of results.” (pg. 26) Of note, the program did not apply a gender sensitive approach to delivery and had only generic references to gender mainstreaming, so the gender dimensions of entrepreneurship and cleantech were not adequately addressed. (TE pg. 27)

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

This TER assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance to be **Likely**. The TE found that the majority of interviewees supported the PMU’s transition to IDEMI for the management of the competition, and that it was well within IDEMI’s capacity to administer. The TE notes that, as a subsidiary of MSME, IDEMI “was appropriately located from an institutional and political perspective,” in addition to having extensive relevant networks within India. (TE pg. 27)

Environmental

The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess environmental sustainability.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The original program document projected US\$ 3 million in co-financing, including US\$ 2.5 million in-kind from the Government of India. However, the TE found that in-kind contributions were received but never quantified. (pg. 3, 14) The TE highlights significant in-kind contributions from MSME, including the time of MSME personnel, office space for the PMU, and hosting several project events, although it is unlikely that these reached the originally projected value of US\$ 2.5 million. (pg. 14)

The TE does not report on materialization of the approximately US\$ 0.5 million in co-financing grants expected from UNIDO and the Government of India.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE states that the project was initially planned for completion in 2017 (pg. 2), though the 2014 PIR indicates a proposed implementation end of March 31, 2016 (pg. 1) The project received no-cost extensions, and the implementation end date was revised in the 2015 PIR (with no explanation provided), and was revised again in the 2016 PIR to June 30, 2017 to allow for a fourth cleantech competition. The project did not officially close until early 2018 to allow for completion of the TE, though the 2017 PIR and other available documents did not reference the additional extension. The TE did not explicitly address these delays; however, this TER does not find any evidence that they affected the project's achievements or sustainability.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links.

The TE found that the project was highly relevant to the Government of India, noting that the program document aligned with the country's "ambition to build a national innovation ecosystem for developing low carbon technologies capable of bringing cheaper (domestically manufactured, non-imported) solutions to the Indian market." (pg. 10) These drivers continued to be relevant, and as India launched the Make in India and Swachh Bharat Abhiyan campaigns in late 2014, the project only further increased in relevance. MSME provided significant in-kind contributions to the project, and its support was highly visible. Nearly all project stakeholders, including government counterparts, expressed a desire for GCIP India to continue. (TE pg. 26)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

Taken together, the TE assesses M&E design and implementation to be **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. This TER, which provides separate ratings, provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry.

The CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012 envisioned an M&E system that tracked project performance to enable adaptive management for successful program implementation. The program document outlined M&E

responsibilities as well as an M&E process consisting of 1) a project inception report, 2) a progress report every three months, and 3) a final project report. In addition, the project document stated that “by making reference to the impact and performance indicators defined in the Project Results Framework, the monitoring plan will track, report on, and review project activities and accomplishments in relation to: a. Energy savings and GHGs emission reductions directly generated by the project...; b. Energy savings and GHGs emission reductions indirectly generated by the project...; c. Overall socio-economic impacts of the various project activities...; and d. Increased awareness of initiatives promoting low carbon innovative technologies in India.” (CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012 pg. 5) The document also noted that midterm and final evaluations would be completed by external consultants.

However, this TER found that baseline values for project indicators were not established at the design phase, limiting the project’s ability to assess and report on progress. In addition, while the project document delineated US\$ 8,600 for the midterm and final evaluations, it lacked a more specific M&E budget, stating that “*some* of UNIDO’s co-financing to the project would be used... for monitoring of the project implementation.” (CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012 pg. 6, emphasis added)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------	--

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for M&E implementation. The project monitored and reported on output-level indicators, and completed annual PIRs; however, it appears that there was no reporting on either the planned outcome areas⁶ or impact indicators⁷ - including expected results on key environmental objectives such as energy savings and GHGs emission reductions. A final evaluation was completed by external consultants; however, there is no mention in the TE or other project documents of a midterm evaluation having been conducted, though the Request for CEO Endorsement included plans for one.

The TE did not indicate whether the project’s periodic monitoring reports were completed on time and of adequate quality. The TE found that the PMU established the necessary databases for program management and progress reporting, but no systems were established for longer-term monitoring of the project (for example, outcomes achieved by competition participants). The TE noted the existence of “informal, ad hoc monitoring” as the PMU stayed in touch with some participants after their participation in the project ended, but this was not a systematic approach nor sufficient for assessing long-term results. However, the TE notes that the resources allocated to M&E (US\$ 20,000) were insufficient for assessing the contribution of the program beyond its immediate results. (TE pg. 21) The TE also identified the absence of a gender analysis and gender-specific monitoring, “despite the program document indicating that gender specific targets would be established and pursued.” (TE pg. 27)

⁶ As articulated in the CEO Endorsement Jan. 2013.

⁷ As articulated in the CEO Endorsement Dec. 2012.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was UNIDO, and the TE rates UNIDO's performance as **Highly Satisfactory**. The TE found that participants and experts (such as mentors and judges) appreciated UNIDO's performance and agreed that the program's day-to-day management was efficient and effective, improving with each passing year. (pg. 28) It notes the straightforward, efficient approach of managing the annual cleantech competition through a small (two-person), stable, centralized PMU. (TE pg. 28) Of note, the TE provided limited detail on UNIDO's performance (one paragraph). This TER downgrades the rating for Quality of Project Implementation to **Satisfactory** due to the weaknesses in M&E implementation outlined in the sections above, and insufficient attention given to gender mainstreaming.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for project execution, but rates the performance of National Counterparts as **Highly Satisfactory**. A UNIDO-based PMU, India's Ministry for Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises (MSME), the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), Alliance for Energy Efficient Economy (AEEE), and National Research Development Corporation (NRDC) were all identified as supporting project execution. The TE provided limited information on project execution, noting that the project received significant in-kind contributions and highly visible backing from MSME, and participants and experts assessed IDEMI's⁸ performance positively when it took over PMU responsibilities in the competition's final year. (pg. 28) In addition, Cleantech Open (CTO), a USA-based accelerator program, served as the project's knowledge partner, providing trainings and webinars for participants. CTO hosted entrepreneurs (including the top 3-4 GCIP participants from each year's competition) in California, USA, to compete for global prizes, expand networking opportunities, and gain exposure to international investors. (TE pg. 2)

⁸ IDEMI, the Institute for Design of Electrical Measuring Instruments, is a Technology Center within the MSME.

It is difficult for this TER to further assess the quality of project execution, but given the aforementioned shortcomings in M&E implementation, this TER rates project execution as **Satisfactory**.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

While the project had high-level, impact indicators for energy savings and GHG emissions reduction, the TE explains that “clearly, there is a large ‘jump’ and many steps between delivery of the GCIP India competition and these high-level impacts.” (p. 24) Despite the project’s intermediate outcome *GHG emission reductions delivered by technologies can be measured*, the TE states that “reporting on GHG reductions were not required through GCIP India, but several identified technologies have clear potential to deliver significant reductions.” (p. 25) Beyond this, the TE does not cite any environmental changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE cited a few “business-level” impacts directly attributable to the program, for example: 1) a participant secured a US\$ 250,000 investment through a connection from GCIP India; 2) a participant secured a US\$ 50,000 loan through a connection from GCIP India; and 3) following targeted advice from the program, a participant launched their product in a completely new and eventually important domestic market. (pg. 21) Potentially more significant than these direct impacts, the TE noted that participants “invariably preferred to characterise GCIP India’s inputs as providing a contribution to improvements in their business, working alongside multiple other inputs.” (pg. 22) For example, participants explained that the program helped increase their confidence, structure their long-term planning, identify customers and markets, increase their visibility, and build a network of like-minded entrepreneurs.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE identifies multiple examples of participants’ capacity strengthened by the program, including increased confidence, more structured long-term planning, identification of customers and markets, increased visibility, and expanded networks. For example, engagement with mentors accelerated participants’ learning and enabled businesses to anticipate problems and avoid common start-up mistakes. Participants highlighted that, “even where investment was not secured, exposure to investors provided insight into how investors think, what they look for, and which (even whether) investment options were most appropriate to pursue.” (TE pg. 22) Participants felt that these contributions from the program helped them develop more robust businesses and business models, and increased their likelihood of success. (TE pg. 23)

b) Governance

The TE notes that GCIP India “aimed to deliver impact beyond the level of individual businesses. Specifically, one of the programme’s central objectives was to develop an entrepreneurial ecosystem within India for cleantech innovation.” (pg. 23) The TE found that the project potentially established some early foundations for a cleantech innovation ecosystem in India through the development of its networks, but this is nonspecific and future scale-up is uncertain. (pg. vii) While the project has close ties to MSME and informal connections to policymakers, it undertook limited policy work and this is the weakest aspect of the network. The TE states that the project had no tangible results on the policy or regulatory environment, but future work could perhaps have a stronger policy influence. (pg. 24) Beyond this, the TE does not cite any governance changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been

established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE does not explicitly cite examples of scale-up or replication. However, it notes that the project laid the foundation for sustainable results with a highly efficient, pro bono model for engaging experts (mentors, judges, etc.) and handover of the PMU (including administration of the cleantech competition) from UNIDO to IDEMI. Moreover, participants and stakeholders (including government partners) almost unanimously agreed that the program should continue, with many offering to support future efforts.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pg. 32):

1. GCIP India effectively delivered valuable support to India's cleantech entrepreneurs. Its focus on business development rather than technological aspects made the project unique and filled a gap for those working in the sector.
2. Participating businesses achieved positive outcomes, including some who reported significant gains directly attributable to the program (such as securing investments and entering new markets). Many participants agreed that the program's contribution to more "soft" skills (for example, increasing confidence, structuring planning, raising visibility, and growing networks) was even more valuable, helping them to build stronger businesses and improve their chances of success.
3. The project's operating model was highly efficient, with a particularly cost-effective approach to pro bono support: high quality external experts (including mentors, judges, and investors) delivered a considerable amount of the project's work at no cost. This is potentially a self-sustaining model for a future program, and numerous participants expressed a desire to support the program in future competitions.
4. The project laid some initial foundations for a cleantech innovation ecosystem in India. Connections and networks developed among the program's participants and experts could help establish an entrepreneurial ecosystem that did not previously exist.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. 32-34):

1. Identify resources to continue the program. While UNIDO should lead the design of any follow-on program, India has sufficient capacity to administer the day-to-day logistics of the program, so UNIDO should shift to a knowledge partner role.
2. Include plans and budget resources to provide post-competition support to participants. This could include, for example, sharing business opportunities and network connections. This could increase the likelihood that results are sustained and contribute to building a national ecosystem for cleantech innovation.
3. Maintain contact with alumni post-competition to better track longer-term results. This would improve the project's ability to assess and improve upon GCIP India's progress toward higher-level impacts.
4. Broaden the mentor pool. The project's mentor pool was strong but lacked specialist expertise in marketing and investment banking, critical areas of need for participants.
5. Ensure the consistency and quality of mentor contributions by developing a systematic approach to oversight.
6. Expand networks. Peer networks formed through the program were especially valued. There are opportunities to grow these connections: UNIDO could link participants across GCIP countries, as well as to their wider international networks.
7. Develop a gender sensitive program design. A significant weakness of GCIP India was the absence of gender mainstreaming in its design and implementation. Any future program should commission a gender analysis in advance and identify mechanisms and relevant indicators to improve gender mainstreaming during implementation.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report provides a thorough assessment of the project, including achievement of objectives and relevant outcomes. However, it did not address every GEF requirement explicitly, for example, project execution, materialization of co-financing, and risks.	5
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and offers clear, convincing findings based on the evidence presented. Evidence was not fully complete, however, for all relevant topics (including, for example, the assessment of the M&E system and report of actual project costs).	5
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Overall, the report offers an extensive assessment of project sustainability, though it does not directly address risks and assumptions (for example, financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental risks).	5
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are supported by the report's findings and evidence presented. Though the recommendations are not entirely comprehensive (lacking suggestions on risk mitigation, improving financial reporting, etc.), they address the key findings overall.	5
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes a table with project costs (including total costs and by outcome area) in an appendix, but it is unclear if the figures presented are actual costs.	3
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides a fairly good evaluation of the project's M&E system. However, the assessment is included under the project's outcome area 4 (<i>Adequate M&E</i>), and is not addressed comprehensively (with a view to the entire project's M&E system) elsewhere. For example, there was limited assessment of M&E initially planned against what was achieved by project end.	4
Overall TE Rating		5

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).