



## Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

<b>Project Title:</b>	The Global Cleantech Innovation Programme for SMEs in Ukraine
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9811
<b>UNIDO ID:</b>	160246
<b>GEF Replenishment Cycle:</b>	GEF-6
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Ukraine
<b>Region:</b>	ECA - Europe and Central Asia
<b>GEF Focal Area:</b>	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)
<b>Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Not applicable
<b>Stand-alone / Child Project:</b>	The Global Cleantech Innovation Programme
<b>Implementing Department/Division:</b>	ENE / CTI
<b>Co-Implementing Agency:</b>	Not applicable
<b>Executing Agency(ies):</b>	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine, Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, State Finance Institution for Innovation, Ministry for Strategic Industries of Ukraine
<b>Project Type:</b>	Medium-Sized Project (MSP)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	36 months
<b>Extension(s):</b>	2
<b>GEF Project Financing:</b>	USD 1,502,875
<b>Agency Fee:</b>	USD 142,773
<b>Co-financing Amount:</b>	USD 12,200,000
<b>Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:</b>	10/17/2018
<b>UNIDO Approval Date:</b>	11/22/2018

<sup>1</sup> Only for GEF-6 projects, if applicable

<b>Actual Implementation Start:</b>	11/28/2018
<b>Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:</b>	USD 1,516699.09
<b>Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:</b>	1/9/2021
<b>Original Project Completion Date:</b>	11/28/2021
<b>Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:</b>	5/31/2023
<b>Current SAP Completion Date:</b>	5/31/2023
<b>Expected Project Completion Date:</b>	5/31/2023
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:</b>	7/31/2023
<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	11/30/2023
<b>UNIDO Project Manager<sup>2</sup>:</b>	Ms. Olga Rataj, Associate Industrial Development Officer

## I. Brief description of project and status overview

<b>Project Objective</b>	
<p>The UNIDO/GEF Project "Global Cleantech Innovation Program for Small and Medium Enterprises in Ukraine" (GCIP Ukraine) is part of a global initiative to promote innovative technologies and create an ecosystem to support innovative entrepreneurship.</p> <p>Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP) - facilitates the development of a low-carbon economy and entrepreneurship by supporting the implementation of innovative clean technologies at small and medium enterprises and startups by disseminating the necessary techniques and tools to improve productivity and competitiveness. The Project focuses on enhancing cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship sustainability in Ukraine. It leads to a long-lasting transformative change in the domestic innovation ecosystem by catalyzing investments and international partnerships to support the country's climate-resilient and low-carbon development.</p> <p>The Project consists of four main components that are consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals, national policy priorities, and the GEF, namely: (1) a National cleantech platform to promote clean technology innovations for global environmental benefits and green jobs in Ukraine; (2) Building national capacity to support and promote clean energy technology innovations; (3) Policy and regulatory framework strengthened for a national cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem; and (4) Monitoring and Evaluation.</p>	
<b>Project core indicators:</b>	
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Expected at Endorsement stage</b>

<sup>2</sup> Person responsible for report content

<b>6</b>	<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO2e)</b>	6,323,626.72 (Tons)
	Expected CO2e (direct)	2,432,123.62
	Expected CO2e (indirect)	3,891,503.10
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Emissions avoided</b>	
	Expected CO2e (direct)	2,432,123.62
	Expected CO2e (indirect)	3,891,503.10
	Anticipated Year	2028
<b>11</b>	<b>Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</b>	720
	Female	290
	Male	430

<b>Baseline</b>
<p>The overall environment for entrepreneurship in Ukraine has many challenges; however, some entrepreneurs are succeeding in building globally successful ventures. Ukraine has improved processes for business formation, but licensing, permits, taxes, and corruption remain significant problems. Ukraine's industrial structure has many non-competitive state-owned enterprises (SOEs), with a small but promising group of innovative entrepreneurial companies focused on international markets.</p> <p>Between 1998 and 2010, the government of Ukraine officially launched Over 200 innovation programmes entitled to state financing. However, more than half have not received funding due to a lack of corresponding procedures during the parliamentary approval phase and the rigidities of state budgeting.</p> <p>The project has conducted thorough analyzes of Ukraine's existing policies and laws related to entrepreneurship, SMEs, and innovation. Despite the existing of a good regulatory framework, there is no explicit reference for promoting cleantech innovation in Ukraine.</p> <p>There are several ongoing international cooperation programmes in innovation, entrepreneurship, and SME development in Ukraine. UNIDO has played an essential role in strengthening the national competencies in disseminating cleaner technologies practices in the industry, particularly among small businesses, through several technical assistance programs.</p> <p>GCIP Ukraine project will build on lessons learned from similar initiatives that UNIDO has successfully implemented with the financial support of GEF in South Africa, Malaysia, Armenia, Morocco, Pakistan, and Thailand. The GCIP approach and methodologies will build on the existing policies, established platforms, and local experience to promote focusing on innovative SMEs through an eco-system approach that will involve identifying start-ups and nurturing, mentoring, and incentivizing technological innovation to promote clean energy technologies and systems in selected SME clusters.</p>

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY23. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY23.

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management<sup>3</sup>, Agencies are expected to closely monitor changes that occur from year to year and demonstrate that they are not simply implementing plans but modifying them in response to developments and circumstances or understanding. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY22, in the last column.

<b>Overall Ratings<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>FY23</b>	<b>FY22</b>
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>
The GEOs/DOs rating did not change, as the national situation and measures associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine did not change from last year, i.e., increased difficulties in implementing and measuring the project's activities and outcomes effectively.		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>
The IP rating did not change, as the national situation and measures associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine did not change from last year, i.e., increased difficulties in implementing and monitoring the project's activities and progress effectively.		
Overall Risk Rating	<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>
The risk rating did not change, as the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine did not change from last year.		

## II. Targeted results and progress to-date

Please describe the progress made in achieving the outputs against key performance indicator's targets in the project's **M&E Plan/Log-Frame at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval**. Please expand the table as needed.

<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>KPIs/Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target level</b>	<b>Progress in FY23</b>
<b>Component 1 – National platform to promote clean technology innovations for global environmental benefits and green jobs in Ukraine</b>				

<sup>3</sup> Adaptive management in the context of an intentional approach to decision-making and adjustments in response to new available information, evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation or research, and experience acquired from implementation, to ensure that the goals of the activity are being reached efficiently

<sup>4</sup> Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and assure that the indicated ratings correspond to the narrative of the report

Outcome 1.1: National level platform/coordinating mechanism established to promote clean energy technology innovations and entrepreneurship

<p>Output 1.1.1: GCIP Ukraine platform established</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GCIP platform established Number of methodologies and guidelines for the competition developed;</li> <li>• No of competition entries, No of semi- finalists and finalists etc.;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No dedicated platform for clean energy technology and SMEs;</li> <li>• Baseline value not available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific methodologies and guidelines (gender-responsive) for participation in and execution of the competition and Accelerator program developed;</li> <li>• At least 20 entrants per category competition in Year 1 (target of 40% women participants) and at least 30 entrants per category competition in Year 2 onwards (target of 40% women participants/mentors/judges);</li> </ul>	<p><b>The 6<sup>th</sup> wave of the Competition-Accelerator Programme (national level) was conducted in 2023</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 48 applications received (41% women)</li> <li>• 25 startup projects were selected. As 11 withdrew, 14 teams took part in the Business Academy, by category: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy Efficiency – 7.1%</li> <li>- Renewable Energy Sources – 7.1%</li> <li>- Waste Management – 14.3%</li> <li>- Medicine – 7.1 %</li> <li>- Ecology – 57.1%</li> <li>- Other – 7.1 %</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Business Academy conducted 12-28 April 2023, with participation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8 Trainers (62.5% women)</li> <li>- 8 Mentors and Experts (66.66% women)</li> <li>- 7 Judges (42.85% women)</li> <li>- 20 Participants (28.1% women)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Final Judging selected 1 National Winner, 9 special nominations awarded, 3 finalists</li> <li>• 8 special nominations specified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Medicine for Sustainable Development"</li> <li>- "Innovations for Food Safety"</li> <li>- "Best Social Project"</li> <li>- "Best Women’s Project"</li> <li>- "Innovations for Sustainable Development of Agriculture"</li> <li>- "Circular Economy"</li> <li>- "Expansion of Geography of Mineral Water Consumers" -</li> <li>- "Waste Recycling"</li> <li>- "Youth Entrepreneurial Initiative"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Output 1.1.2: GCIP community and network maintained</p>	<p>The number of GCIP community identified and maintained</p>	<p>Baseline is assumed to be zero</p>	<p>At least 6 GCIP communities identified.</p>	<p>Working contacts created and maintained with the 6 identified GCIP communities</p>

Outcome 1.2: Clean technology entrepreneurs identified, coached and promoted during and beyond the GCIP Accelerator

<p>Output 1.2.1: Post-Accelerator support provided for start-ups and SMEs to access to finance and market entry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No of SMEs and Startups trained on product development and market entry;</li> <li>• Number of investors/ funding mechanism identified.</li> </ul>	<p>No dedicated similar support programmes reported - baseline is assumed to be zero;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 60 SMEs and Startups receive training on product development and market entry (with at least 40% being women);</li> <li>• At least 6 investors identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The signed grant contracts with the 21 startups winners were reviewed to determine the possibility of disbursing the fund and monitoring the activities within the context on the ongoing war. 6 startups were excluded due to different reasons, i.e., relocation outside Ukraine for safety reasons, and the difficulties in meeting the contractual agreement.</li> <li>• 4 investors (instead of 6) identified</li> </ul>
---	--	---	---	--

**Component 2 – Building national capacity for the support and promotion of clean technology innovations**

Outcome 2.1: National institutional capacity built to support and organize the Cleantech competition and accelerator during and beyond project duration

<p>Output 2.1.1: Capacity building of national institutions and industrial associations to host support and sustain the GCIP, and 15 mentors and 10 judges identified and trained.</p>	<p>No of SMEs and Startups trained on product development and market entry;</p> <p>Number of mentors/judges trained</p>	<p>No dedicated similar training reported - baseline is assumed to be zero;</p> <p>No of training programmes for mentors/judges reported.</p>	<p>At least 15-20 SMEs and/or startups trained per cycle;</p> <p>At least 15 mentors and 10 judges trained;</p>	<p>5 Regional Cleantech Accelerators established, hosted by 5 national universities, which each successfully competed 2 waves of Competition-Accelerator (fully online using Zoom) during June 2021-May 2023 (apart from Kherson National Technical University, which ran just one wave during Autumn 2021 then paused activities due to war in Ukraine)</p> <p><b><u>Totals during 2 waves of Competition-Acceleration (regional level):</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 115 semi-finalists selected</li> <li>• 79 finalists</li> <li>• 35 special nomination winners</li> <li>• 10 National Winners</li> </ul> <p><b>Total mentors and trainers pool of GCIP Ukraine:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 43 Mentors</li> <li>• 44 Trainers</li> <li>• 48 Judges</li> </ul> <p><b>National level:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 Mentors (45% women)</li> <li>• 16 Trainers (50% women)</li> <li>• 14 Judges (35.7% women)</li> </ul> <p><b>Regional level:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21 Mentors</li> <li>• 28 Trainers</li> <li>• 34 Judges</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---	---

Output 2.1.2: Impact monitoring, advocacy and Promotion.	Annual Innovation Conference held, GCIP platform established	No states/regions and SME clusters identified yet.	At least 1 publication published annually and 1 GCIP platform established.	Annual Innovation Conference was not held but other dissemination efforts exceeded targets, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GCIP Ukraine website created, regularly updated <a href="https://gcupkraine.com/">https://gcupkraine.com/</a></li> <li>• 236 articles pushing in mass media + pages of project partners/stakeholders</li> <li>• 700 posts to social pages of project, partners, startups about GCIP activities</li> <li>• 18 promotional videos produced; promotional campaign in opening ceremony</li> <li>• Printed materials (manuals, certificates, brochures, notebooks, pens, bags, folders) designed and distributed to promote GCIP Ukraine</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

**Component 3 – Policy and regulatory framework strengthened for national Cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem**

Outcome 3.1: Policy and Institutional framework strengthened to promote and support clean technology innovations in startups and SMEs.

Output 3.1.1: Policy analysis report on best practice policies, regulations and incentives required for the promotion of clean technology innovations developed	Policies, regulations and programs amended or developed to create more supportive environment for clean energy technology innovations in/by SMEs	Current policy and institutional frameworks not focused on clean energy technology innovations.	Assessment of existing relevant policies and economic sectors requiring support for promotion of Cleantech; Policy assessment report including stakeholder mapping for Cleantech in Ukraine developed.	Policy Assessment Report produced, informed by extensive analysis and reviews undertaken
Output 3.1.2: Policy recommendations on how to enhance the clean technology innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems developed and roadmap in place		No dedicated roadmap available.	Roadmap available to highlight necessary improvements of policy framework on cleantech innovations; monitor its implementation progress by PMU	Roadmap with recommendations, with progress of achievement monitored by PMU not feasible during project's lifetime.
Output 3.1.3: National institutional capacity	No of subnational cleantech	No dedicated similar capacity	50 staff from partner and national	SFII representatives (partner) were involved in planning all GCIP Ukraine

strengthened for sustainability	stakeholder meetings held	programme reported - baseline is assumed to be zero	institutions receive training on competition organization (with at least 40% being women); At least 3 stakeholder meetings held (at least 30% women participants) in 3 years	activities and studied the Business Academy for further use in SFII's work Staff of national institutions and partners involved in several workshops to develop expertise in enhancing enabling conditions to foster cleantech innovation adoption. 8 stakeholder meetings held (versus target of 3)
---------------------------------	---------------------------	---	---	--

#### Component 4 – Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Outcome 4.1: Adequate monitoring of all project indicators together with regular evaluations to ensure successful project implementation

Output 4.1.1: Terminal project evaluation conducted	Achievement of project targets and improvement in gender mainstreaming	No evaluation system in place to monitor and track project achievements	Independent terminal evaluation to capture the impact and sustainability of the programme	The project Terminal Evaluation is ongoing since March 2023, and it is expected to be finalized on the 31 <sup>st</sup> of July 2023.
Output 4.1.2: Documentation of lessons learned and best practices from pilot experience and dissemination	Terminal evaluation report, leaflets/brochures, and case study	No documentation system in place to share the lesson learn and best practices from the programme	1 Terminal evaluation report, at least 2 leaflets/brochures and case study each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Terminal Evaluation report is expected on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July 2023.</li> <li>No other progress FY23 due to the ongoing war in Ukraine.</li> </ul>

### III. Project Risk Management

1. Please indicate the overall project-level risks and the related risk management measures: (i) as identified in the CEO Endorsement document, and (ii) progress to-date. Please expand the table as needed.

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 22	(i) Risk level FY 23	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk <sup>5</sup>
1	<b>Institutional risk</b> (Lack of capable and relevant institutional partners for	L	L	During the first 6 months of project implementation and based on the capacity assessment of the PPG phase, UNIDO will directly involve the key relevant institutions and partners of the project to establish working	During the 2,5 years of project implementation, the following key relevant institutions and partners of the project to establish working relations and collaboration were involved:	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>5</sup> New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.



<p>project execution and sustainability)</p>			<p>relations and collaboration. UNIDO will also ensure that such key institutions and partners will be closely engaged in the project implementation process. Furthermore, the project will draw from expertise and long-standing experience from methodologies and tools of the GCIP partner's network.</p> <p>Additionally, efforts will be made to embed in the capacity building activities principles and instruments from quality management system based on ISO 9001:2015. To ensure that the three tiers cooperation for cleantech innovation is embedded in the Ukrainian Institutional Management Culture.</p> <p>The project will work with Ukrainian institutions that have some or substantial experience in setting-up and operating technology competitions or competitive grant funding programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine,</li> <li>• Ministry of Economy of Ukraine,</li> <li>• State Finance Institution for Innovation,</li> <li>• Ministry for Strategic Industries of Ukraine,</li> <li>• State Agency of Energy Efficiency and Energy Saving of Ukraine;</li> </ul> <p>The project collaborates with, at least, 32 Universities, business incubators, science parks, business associations and accelerators. Additionally, 5 pilot cleantech accelerators in Kherson, Mykolaiv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Sumy and Slovyansk cities were established to extend the impact reach.</p> <p>Despite Russia's large-scale aggression, the effective functioning of institutional structures has been preserved in Ukraine, including those with which the project cooperates.</p>	
<p><b>2 Market risk</b>  (Lack of interest by the public and industrial associations in participating in the Cleantech competition and Accelerator programme as entrepreneurs and mentors, resulting in limited participation, or entries with low quality, especially in the first years</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>Proper communication programs will be prepared and implemented with adequate resources allocated to ensure effective and widespread communication of the Cleantech program; tailored workshops will be carried out to support this.</p> <p>Effective support will be provided to innovative SMEs/entrants. User-friendly entry forms will be prepared. Mentors will be identified through stringent selection criteria and an assessment of their ownership of the competition shall be determined at an early stage. Partnerships with the GCPI network and with Innovation programs in EU will be firmly pursued.</p>	<p>The effective work of the PMU with the startup society of Ukraine, inventors, state partners and national universities contributed to the effective involvement of startup teams in the competition of startup clients. The following tools were used as mitigation measures for the market risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The website of project was designed, and there is publishing an information and news of project activities (<a href="https://gcipukraine.com">https://gcipukraine.com</a>);</li> <li>• A YouTube channel (GCIP Ukraine), Facebook and Twitter pages (Cleantech Ukraine) were created and started;</li> <li>• 17 mentors, 3 international and 4 national trainers were involved in the project activities' implementation;</li> <li>• Six (6) training modules on entrepreneurship and business were developed;</li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guideline for judges and mentors were developed; and</li> </ul> <p>Five (5) pilot regional Cleantech accelerators in Kherson, Mykolaiv, Slovyansk, Ivano-Frankivsk and Sumy established.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Financing risks</b>  (Incentive and financial support system are insufficient)	M	M	<p>According to the IMF, in 2017 the country recorded a 2% GDP growth and a 12% annual inflation rate. Estimates for 2018 forecast a 3.2% growth and 10% inflation. On the other hand, public debt increased to 86.2% of GDP in 2017, from 81, 2% in 2016. Considering challenging economic situation and potential financial risks in the country, project would seek to explore international investments and funds, such as North Capital Holding Group, Bleyzer Foundation and others.</p> <p>In addition, an active articulation with global and EU financial partners of the Global GCIP network will be pursued as well with new partnerships with European institutions and synergies with EU ongoing programs such as HORIZON 2020.</p> <p>Moreover, the project will promote the access of the GCIP Accelerator semi-finalists and finalists to government-funded support programs and initiatives for SME development and technology modernization and innovation.</p>	<p>The project promotes access to government-funded support programs and initiatives for SME development and technology modernization and innovation, international venture funds, Ukrainian banking institutions GCIP to semi-finalists, finalists and winners of regional accelerators.</p> <p>A certain limitation of attracting funding is the lack of prototypes for most teams. For this reason, the project is providing grant supports to qualified startups to support prototype development; thus, facilitating access to finance.</p> <p>The war certainly complicates the attraction of investments in Ukraine; however, successful startup teams start their businesses in partner countries and thus bypass this risk and attract financial resources.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4</b>	<b>Climate change risks</b>	L	L	<p>There is no climate change risk foreseen for the achievement of the project's objectives; this will be further assessed in the ESS analysis and an ESMP</p>	<p>There is no climate change risk at this moment.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5</b>	<b>Social and gender risk</b>  There could be a risk of resistance against the involvement of women or activities that promote gender equality and empowerment of women or there could be a lack of	L	L	<p>To mitigate this risk the project will pursue thorough and gender-responsive communication showing the benefits of gender equality for both women and men, and ensure stakeholder involvement at all levels, with special regard to involving women and men, as well as CSOs and NGOs, and gender experts. This shall mitigate social and gender-related risks, promote gender equality, create a culture of mutual acceptance and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60% of the PMU are women;</li> <li>The percentage of women participation as mentors and trainers are 53% and 50%, respectively;</li> <li>33% of the project experts are women for judging projects under the GCIP Accelerator; and</li> <li>In the project were involved about 30% of the GCIP</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>interest in, the project activities from stakeholders, especially with regard to the active promotion of gender equality.</p> <p>Low participation rates of suitable female candidates due to lack of interest, inadequate project activity or missing qualified female population within engineering sector.</p>			<p>understanding, and maximize the potential contribution of the project to improving gender equality in the energy field.</p> <p>To attract qualified female candidates to the project, adequate and gender-responsive communication strategy will be carried out by reaching out to women's groups and creating partnerships with women associations, like the Ukrainian Women in Business. This will enable to promote the GCIP activities with flexible tailored actions among women entrepreneurs and innovators.</p>	<p>Accelerator programme are women.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

2. If the project received a **sub-optimal risk rating (H, S)** in the previous reporting period, please state the **actions taken** since then to mitigate the relevant risks and improve the related risk rating. Please also elaborate on reasons that may have impeded any of the sub-optimal risk ratings from improving in the current reporting cycle; please indicate actions planned for the next reporting cycle to remediate this.

The project risk FY23 is the same as FY22, but significantly higher than the risks identified during CEO endorsement due to the ongoing war in Ukraine. These risks are associated with the safety of the project personnel, assets, and the ability to have measurable impact.

3. Please indicate any implication of the **COVID-19** pandemic on the progress of the project.

The outbreak of COVID-19 has affected the project implementation. In response, the project developed a mechanism for further implementation of the training program online for the semi-finalists of the GCIP Ukraine competition and universities staff. Distance learning opportunities were explored, and the curriculums for GCIP Ukraine Business Academy and training for universities were adapted.

All consultation and meeting with potential participants of GCIP Ukraine Accelerator, stakeholders, partners were conducted via online platforms.

4. Please clarify if the project is facing delays and is expected to request an **extension**.

No

5. Please provide the **main findings and recommendations of completed MTR**, and elaborate on any actions taken towards the recommendations included in the report.

The project has finalized the MTR in August 2021. The summary of the MTR findings, recommendations and actions can be seen in the below table:

Findings	Recommendations	Actions taken
There has been good progress in implementation of the project at the time of the Mid-Term Review, though the Pandemic and some other issues such as change in Project Manager in Vienna and some early communication issues have caused delays in implementation.	Extension of the project duration by 6-12 months so that the project results can be achieved as planned.	The project was extended 1-year, to end on 30 November 2022.
Some of the documents produced as an output of the project were not aligned with the log-frame outputs and targets, making it difficult to use them as means of verification of results.	Documentation needs to be improved, particularly to streamline the documents based on targets and means of verification as described in the log-frame.	All documents have been reviewed to streamline it based on the defined deliverables.
There is a potential for delays in project completion and budget overrun/underspend if the post-accelerator support for early-stage start-ups is not well managed.	Post-Accelerator support of product/prototype development must be managed with close monitoring of time and expenses.	The project team has revised the project work plan and budget as part of the extension process of the project to ensure the project's financial effectiveness.
It will be difficult for the project to achieve its required outputs within the current timeline, and the current end date of 30 November 2021.	Extension of the project duration by 6-12 months so that the project results can be achieved as planned.	The project was extended 1-year, to end on 30 November 2022.

#### IV. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

1. As part of the requirements for **projects from GEF-6 onwards**, and based on the screening as per the UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP), which category is the project?

- Category A project
- X Category B project
- Category C project

(By selecting Category C, I confirm that the E&S risks of the project have not escalated to Category A or B).

	E&S risk	Mitigation measures undertaken during the reporting period	Monitoring methods and procedures used in the reporting period
(i) Risks identified in ESMP at time of CEO Endorsement	NA because of the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine.	NA because of the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine.	NA because of the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine.
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	NA because of the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine.	NA because of the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine.	NA because of the national situation associated with the ongoing war in Ukraine.

## V. Stakeholder Engagement

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes** regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project (based on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent document submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

The Project cooperates with significant partners, including the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine, the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, State Finance Institution for Innovation. Since the Government of Ukraine established the Ministry for Strategic Industries of Ukraine and assigned it the responsibility of coordinating work with UNIDO, the Project established effective and constructive cooperation with the Ministry for Strategic Industries of Ukraine during the reporting period.

The Project involves key stakeholders in conducting the annual accelerator; in particular, stakeholder representatives are mentors, national trainers, and judges. To do this, the Project has developed an appropriate program for their training, specific methodologies, and guidelines.

For capacity building of national institutions, the Project conducts training for 32 Ukrainian universities on creating and managing business incubators. In addition, on a base of 5 universities in the regions of Ukraine, Kherson National Technical University (Kherson City), Donbas State Pedagogical University (Slavyansk Town), Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University (Mykolaiv City), Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Ivano-Frankivsk city), Sumy State University (Sumy city) the 5-pilot regional cleantech accelerators GCIP Ukraine were established and started their work. The universities signed contracts with UNIDO to create a pilot regional cleantech accelerator GCIP Ukraine.

2. Please provide any feedback submitted by national counterparts, GEF OFP, co-financiers, and other partners/stakeholders of the project (e.g. private sector, CSOs, NGOs, etc.).

In a letter addressed to UNIDO's Director General, Mr. Li Yong dated 10.02.2021, the Prime Minister of the Ministry for Strategic Industries of Ukraine, Mr. Oleg Uruskiy, thanked Mr. Carlos Chanduvi-Suarez and the National Project Coordinator, GCIP Ukraine on the successful implementation of the Project.

Based on the initial Terminal Evaluation draft report, the following are feedback received during the interviewing process of the Independent Evaluation Consultant "Dr. Joyce Miller":

- National counterparts highlighted that the project's coverage of Ukraine's full geography increased the project's relevance and also pointed to the important role that it filled in subsequently adopting

such a strong regional focus, explaining that “before, there were no such accelerator programmes in this region” (referring to Donetsk), identifying this development as “critical for bringing together mentors, consultants, relevant information and financial support”.

- Regional stakeholders also emphasized the project’s role in strengthening the involved universities’ competences and reputation (“it helped develop our institution’s strong leadership and regional coordination role supporting clean technology development and implementation, as well as facilitating stakeholder collaboration”). A Regional Accelerator representative affirmed that “all the directions relevant for GCIP are totally in tune with our university’s goals”. Another pointed to the universities’ involvement as well as promoting regional economic development and environmental protection, asserting that “the Accelerator’s operation has made it possible to select innovative projects that can help improve the environmental situation in the region in the future”. A Mykolaiv representative saw the GCIP framework as providing a “unique testing ground” to operationalise the tripartite collaboration of academia, government and industry laid down in the region’s strategy for development until 2027<sup>6</sup>.
- Industry stakeholders also remarked on the pertinence of the intervention, indicating that “through GCIP, Ukraine has been added to the global market of startups” and it “opened the way for a global distribution of Ukrainian inventions and research”. Furthermore, the intervention was expected to build SME competitiveness and open avenues to national, regional and (and possibly global markets) through the project’s anticipated links with investors, business, and commercial partners (p20, Project Document).
- The project was seen to directly address a key gap in entrepreneurial skills. Mentors emphasized that the programme helped startups “transform their cleantech ideas into viable commercial products and services” and “acquire important soft skills like pitching and leadership competences”. The involved entrepreneurs commented on the value-add of the GCIP approach, compared to other forms of startup support available in Ukraine at the time, illustrated by the following feedback: “some competitions just evaluate, and we weren’t ready for that: we needed the business development that GCIP brought to us”; “most existing competitions in Ukraine are for experienced projects but they are not very good for young projects”; and “GCIP gave us the most valuable knowledge, we never had such an experience before”.

### 3. Please provide any **relevant stakeholder consultation** documents.

A cross-section of relevant institutional partners was actively involved in supporting the project’s execution and governance through the Project Steering Committee, which met regularly until October 2021. In view of the ongoing security situation, which understandably shifted governmental attention and resources, the engagement of national counterparts is deemed to have functioned to a feasible extent in fulfilling its guidance and oversight roles.

The latest Project Steering Committee minutes can be found [here](#).

## VI. Gender Mainstreaming

---

<sup>6</sup> President of Ukraine’s official website (21 August 2020), “The Mykolaiv Region has a Great Potential in Agriculture, Tourism, Metallurgy and Shipbuilding <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/glava-derzhavi-mikolayivshina-maye-potuzhniy-potencial-u-sil-62897> [18 July 2023

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please report on the **progress** achieved on implementing **gender-responsive measures** and **using gender-sensitive indicators**, as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval (in the project results framework, gender action plan or equivalent),.

GCIP Ukraine pays considerable attention to supporting and engaging women in business. Thus, among the participants of the 2nd and 3rd waves of the Acceleration Program, GCIP Ukraine involved about 30% of women of GCIP Acceleration program participants, 53% of mentors, 60% of trainers, and 33% of experts in judging projects of GCIP Accelerator are women. Besides, 60% of women work in the PMU of GCIP Ukraine. Also, to promote gender equality and women's empowerment within the framework of the GCIP Ukraine, Project established the contacts with the Institute for partnership and development, particularly with its projects Inspiring women and Women's business, as well as with the Women entrepreneurship club "Lean In" were established. The Project created the GCIP Ukraine Women Network, and there is also an award for women entrepreneurs.

## VII. Knowledge Management

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on any **knowledge management activities / products**, as documented at CEO Endorsement / Approval.

The project developed its official website (<https://gqipukraine.com/>) acting as a platform where program information, challenges, lessons learned, and success stories are shared. The online platform is an important tool for the NPC to the participants' collect data, judges, and mentors, to foster continuous knowledge exchanges in the GCIP community and to archive all project deliverables. Moreover, it facilitates the registration of participants, the training delivery and the matchmaking between alumni, investors, judges, mentors, etc.

In the framework of knowledge and information sharing, seven (7) training manuals were developed for further implementation in the learning process (<https://gqipukraine.com/akseleraciya/navchalni-moduli/>). Also, the GCIP Ukraine Project brochure (2nd version) was developed, in addition to 45 articles on GCIP Ukraine activities published in mass media. More than 255 publications on GCIP Ukraine activities published on social pages of the project, project partners and startups.

2. Please list any **relevant knowledge management mechanisms / tools** that the project has generated.

Additional online tools used by the project team to exchange and disseminate knowledge and information:

- Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/CleantechUkraine/?eid=ARA70E3tH-mxzOclR61 - cFStcyFoflqm3fyxzRkB9oLL-VshYtpoKEEUJjSgB58LexHE2JiWLFiSLn7>);
- Twitter ([https://twitter.com/GCIP\\_Ukraine](https://twitter.com/GCIP_Ukraine)) and Telegram channel (GCIP Ukraine), Telegram channel (Cleantech Ukraine); and
- YouTube channel (GCIP Ukraine) ([https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCcx00gU\\_rSgJ2hQRafma5MQ?view\\_as=subscriber](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCcx00gU_rSgJ2hQRafma5MQ?view_as=subscriber)).

Moreover, the project video interviewed the founders and the project team of Uf.Bee and BIOC projects to create videos and high-quality photos of the above startups for further branding purposes use.

Cleantech news are posted on the project's website and social pages. Information about UNIDO's key achievements in Ukraine published in the UNDAF Ukraine 2020 report for the UNRCO (suitable verifiable

indicators/targets that have been achieved in 2020 under GCIP Ukraine projects at the output level and higher). Project prepared the materials and data on measurable and SDG-related results of the Cleantech Ukraine (as well as some pictures and infographics) to the UNECE SDG report.

Commissioned by UNIDO, in line with its own accountability and organisational learning requirements, the project Terminal Evaluation covered the project's design and implementation, through to its close at the end of May 2023. The TE's purpose was to assess the project's performance in terms of its Progress-to-Impact, Project Design, Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability of Benefits and to promote operational improvement, learning, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned for enhancing the implementation of ongoing projects and design of new interventions.

Carried out during March-May 2023 by an independent consultant, Dr. Joyce Miller, the TE consisted of: i) review of key documents; ii) assessment of project design, including reconstruction of its Theory of Change (TOC); iii) in depth interviews of key stakeholders (41 in total) engaged in or who benefitted from the project's activities; iv) online survey of primarily Ukrainian-speaking beneficiaries, which achieved a 32% response rate (71 of 223 respondents). An evidence-based approach was used to develop the findings, lessons learned, and recommendations.

## VIII. Implementation progress

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes achieved/observed** with regards to project implementation.

The project was operationally closed on May 31, 2023. The final TE will be issued on July 31, 2023, but the draft report, which is not expected to undergo any further changes, already informed this final PIR and all relevant sections.

### **Cumulative outcomes observed:**

National Cleantech Platform established in 2019 with successful completion of 6 waves of Competition-Accelerator during project's extended timeframe (January 2019-May 2023) versus the planned 3 waves over 3 years

From 2<sup>nd</sup> wave (2020), shifted to online delivery, which required adaptive management, new material development, new protocols, learning

6 waves of Competition-Acceleration (national level) attracted a total of 397 applications, ranging each wave from 48 (2023) to 82 (2019), with an average of 66 applications per wave

### **Totals during 6 waves of Competition-Acceleration (national level):**

- 397 applications received
- 139 semi-finalists selected
- 75 finalists
- 45 nominated winners
- 6 National Winners

At least 20 entrants per category attracted in each wave through open call for applications, according to interviewee



National Level: % of applications or startups per category, based on data reported data from PMU in final PIR covering January 2019-May 2023

Wave (national level)	Waste Management	Wastewater Treatment	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy Sources	Resource Efficiency	Organic Farming	Ecology	Medicine	Other
1	37	6	28	21	-	5	-	2	1
2	16	-	27	21	16	-	5	5	10
3	32	-	9	9	9	-	14		27
4	27.8	-	11.1	16.7	16.7	-	5.6	1	-
5	21.4	-	7.1	28.6	7.1	-	42.9	-	-
6	-	-	7.1	7.1	-	-	57.1	-	7.1

### 1<sup>st</sup> wave Competition-Accelerator (national level) - 2019

Application Form + 3 training modules for Business Academy + 6 training manuals developed to support the learning process

- 82 applications received, by category:
  - Waste Management – 37%
  - Wastewater Treatment – 6%
  - Energy Efficiency – 28%
  - Renewable Energy Sources – 21%
  - Organic Farming – 5%
  - Medicine – 2%
  - Other – 1%
- 20 days of face-to-face training in Business Academy for 2 groups of semi-finalists
- Final judging (November 2019) selected 1 National Winner, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> place winners, 6 special nominations, 40 semi-finalists (30% women), 17 finalists

### 2<sup>nd</sup> wave Competition-Accelerator (national level) - 2020

3 online training modules developed for Business Academy + 1 training manual developed about how to work and conduct online training and webinars to support the learning process

- 80 applications received, by category:
  - Energy Efficiency - 27%
  - Renewable Energy Sources - 21%
  - Waste Management - 16%
  - Resource Efficiency 16%
  - Medicine - 5%
  - Ecology - 5%
  - Other - 10%
- 23 semi-finalists selected. As 4 teams withdrew, 19 semi-finalists went through Business Academy (17% women) with
- 16 days of training for semi-finalists conducted online
- 16 October to 16 November 2020
- The final judging selected 1 National Winner, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> place winners, 19 finalists; 5 special nominations addressing UN SDGs were specified:
  - "Medicine for Sustainable Development"

- "Best Women's Project"
- "Clean Water"
- "Best Bioenergy Project"
- "Technological Breakthrough"

### **3<sup>rd</sup> wave Competition-Accelerator (national level) - 2021**

3 online training modules developed for Business Academy

- 66 applications received with 30 semi-finalists selected. As 2 teams withdrew, 28 semi-finalists (13% of women) participated in 12 training days conducted online (18 May – 4 June 2021), by category:
  - Energy Efficiency - 9%
  - Renewable Energy Sources - 9%
  - Waste Management - 32%
  - Resource Efficiency - 9%
  - Ecology -14%
  - Other - 27%
- Final judging selected 1 National Winner, 22 finalists; 7 nominations addressing UN SDGs including nomination resulting from cooperation with OSCE Project for startup projects related to climate change adaptation, environment/water management in Dniester Basin:
  - "Creative Approach to Problem of Rational Use of Resources"
  - "Women's Leadership"
  - "Circular Economy"
  - "Global Impact on Development of the World Economy"
  - "Technological Breakthrough"
  - "Waste Disposal Solutions"
  - "Socio-Ecological Project"

### **4<sup>th</sup> wave Competition-Accelerator (national level) - 2021**

- 64 applications received, by category:
  - Energy efficiency –11.1%
  - Renewable energy sources – 16.7%
  - Waste management – 27.8%
  - Resource efficiency – 16.7%
  - Medicine – 1%
  - Ecology – 5.6%
- Business Academy conducted online 19 February – 19 March 2021 with participation of:
  - 6 Trainers (83.3% women)
  - 9 Mentors and Experts (66.66% women)
  - 7 Judges 42.85% women)
  - 39 Participants (36.8% women)
- Final judging selected 1 National Winner, 8 finalists; 8 special nominations addressing UN SDGs specified:
  - "Women's Leadership"
  - "Best Female Project"
  - "Medicine for Sustainable Development"
  - "Innovations for Integrated Development of Cities"
  - "Promising Technology for Sustainable Energy"
  - "Best Project in Food Industry"
  - "Innovations for the Beauty and Food Industry"

- “Sustainable Use of Fuel Resources”

#### **5<sup>th</sup> wave Competition-Accelerator (national level) - 2022**

- 57 applications received
- Business Academy conducted 11-26 October 2022, with participation of:
  - 6 Trainers (83.3% women)
  - 9 Mentors and Experts (66.66% women)
  - 7 Judges (42.85% women)
  - 23 Participants (36.8% women)
- Participating startups, by category:
  - Energy Efficiency – 7.1%
  - Renewable Energy Sources – 28.6%
  - Waste Management – 21.4%
  - Resource Efficiency – 7.1%
  - Ecology – 42.9%
- Final Judging on 10-11 November 2022 selected 1 National Winner, 6 finalists; 6 special nominations addressing UN SDGs were specified:
  - “Renewable Energy”
  - “Healthy and Safe Environment”
  - “Innovations for Sustainable Development of Agriculture”
  - “Waste Recycling”
  - “Best Youth Project”
  - “Women’s Leadership”

#### **6<sup>th</sup> wave Competition-Accelerator (national level) - 2023**

- 48 applications received (41% women)
- 25 startup projects were selected. As 11 withdrew, 14 teams took part in the Business Academy, by category:
  - Energy Efficiency – 7.1%
  - Renewable Energy Sources – 7.1%
  - Waste Management – 14.3%
  - Medicine – 7.1 %
  - Ecology – 57.1%
  - Other – 7.1 %
- Business Academy conducted 12-28 April 2023, with participation of:
  - 8 Trainers (62.5% women)
  - 8 Mentors and Experts (66.66% women)
  - 7 Judges (42.85% women)
  - 20 Participants (28.1% women)
- Final Judging selected 1 National Winner, 9 special nominations awarded, 3 finalists
- 8 special nominations specified:
  - "Medicine for Sustainable Development"
  - "Innovations for Food Safety"
  - "Best Social Project"
  - "Best Women’s Project"
  - "Innovations for Sustainable Development of Agriculture"
  - "Circular Economy"
  - "Expansion of Geography of Mineral Water Consumers" - "Waste Recycling"
  - "Youth Entrepreneurial Initiative"

**Totals during 6 waves of Competition-Acceleration (national level):**

- 397 applications received
- 139 semi-finalists selected
- 75 finalists
- 45 nominated winners
- 6 National Winners

**Mentors and trainers involved:**

- 22 Mentors (45% women)
- 16 Trainers (50% women)
- 14 Judges (women 35.7% women)

**Capacity Building of 5 Regional Cleantech Accelerators trained in GCIP methodology:**

- 21 Mentors
- 28 Trainers
- 34 Judges

**Total pool of GCIP-trained mentors and trainers:**

- 43 Mentors
- 44 Trainers
- 48 Judges

Additionally, the project provided support to 5 universities in the creation of pilot regional cleantech accelerators, namely Kherson National Technical University (Kherson city), Donbas State Pedagogical University (Slavyansk town), Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University (Mykolaiv city), Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Ivano-Frankivsk city), Sumy State University (Sumy city) were opened. Universities signed contracts with UNIDO for the creation of 5 pilot regional cleantech accelerators GCIP Ukraine and started their work. The Center for Support of Innovation and Technology at the basis of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine is at the preparation and opening stage now.

As part of the development of a national ecosystem for promoting innovation, the project has conducted a training session for the management of Ukrainian universities that are interested in creating a business incubator. The purpose of the training session was dedicated to learning about the issues of creating accelerators in universities, the development of entrepreneurship in universities, and the peculiarities of entering the Asian market. The main trainer was Mr. Karthik Rampalli, Innovations and Future Creation Inc. (MIRAI SOUZO, Japan, <https://miraisozo.co.jp>), Global Shaper at World Economic Forum.

An integral part of GCIP Ukraine is to build the capacity of local and national institutions, including government agencies focused on SME development, clean technology, innovation, and entrepreneurship, to create an ecosystem for cleantech.

Some challenges during the project implementation period were connected with COVID 19 pandemic. As a result, the project developed a mechanism for further implementation of the training program for the semi-finalists of the GCIP Ukraine competition and university staff. Distance learning opportunities were explored, and the curriculums for GCIP Ukraine Business Academy and training for universities were adapted.

Moreover, the project faced implementation delays due to the ongoing war in Ukraine. Most activities have been paused given the operational risks on PMU and assets. A 6-month extension was requested and granted for the project's implementation period, to allow for completing

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**<sup>7</sup> to the approved project that may have been introduced during the implementation period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

Please tick each category for which a change has occurred and provide a description of the change in the related textbox. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Results Framework	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	The project duration was extended 1-year twice in October 2021, and October 2022 due to implementation delays and risks associated with COVID-19 and the ongoing war in Ukraine.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	NA

3. Please provide progress related to the **financial implementation** of the project.

Due to the current ongoing war and associated risks, there are no financial implementations other than the project team and salaries, expert payments, and disbursements of contractual financial obligations. Most activities have been paused to ensure the safety of the project personnel and assets.

### IX. Work Plan and Budget

1. Please provide **an updated project work plan and budget** for the remaining duration of the project, as per last approved project extension. Please expand/modify the table as needed.
  - There is no updated work plan as the project closed operationally on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023.
  - The project budget status can be found [here](#).
  - Below is the latest approved work plan and budget

<sup>7</sup> As described in Annex 9 of the *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines*, **minor amendments** are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%.

Outputs by Project Component	2021				2022				2023				GEF Grant Budget Available (US\$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
<b>Component 1 – National cleantech platform to promote clean technology innovations for global environmental benefits and green jobs in Ukraine</b>													
Outcome 1: National level platform/coordinating mechanism established to promote clean energy technology innovations and entrepreneurship													
Output 1.1: GCIP Ukraine platform established, 3 annual cleantech Accelerator conducted across selected SME clusters													USD 15,000
Output 1.2: GCIP community and network maintained													USD 7,000
Outcome 2: Clean technology entrepreneurs identified, coached and promoted during and beyond the GCIP Accelerator													
Output 2.1: Post-Acceleration support provided for start-ups and SMEs to access finance and market entry													
<b>Component 2 – Building national capacity for the support and promotion of clean technology innovations</b>													
Outcome 2: National institutional capacity built to support and organize the GCIP Accelerator during and beyond the project duration													
Output 2.1: Capacity building of national institutions and industrial associations to host, support and sustain the GCIP, and 15 mentors and 10 judges identified and trained													USD 12,000
Output 2.2: Impact monitoring, advocacy and promotion													USD 5,000
<b>Component 3 – Policy and regulatory framework strengthened for national Cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem</b>													
Outcome 3: Policy and Institutional framework strengthened to promote and support clean technology innovations in startups and SMEs													
Output 3.1: Policy analysis report on the best practices, regulations and incentives required for the promotion of clean technology innovations developed													USD 7,000
Output 3.2: Policy recommendations on how to enhance the clean technology innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem developed and roadmap in place													USD 6,200
Output 3.3: National institutional capacity strengthened for sustainability													USD 8,000
<b>Component 4 – Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E)</b>													
Outcome 4: Adequate monitoring of all project indicators together with regular evaluations to ensure successful project implementation													
Output 4.1: Terminal project evaluation conducted													USD 30,000
Output 4.2: Documentation of lessons learnt and best practices from pilot experience and dissemination													USD 6,700

## X. Synergies

### 1. Synergies achieved:

NA
----

### 3. Stories to be shared (Optional)

NA
----

## XI. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate.

Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com>

Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location and Activity Description
Ukraine - Kiev	50.45466	30.5238	Kyiv City	Establishment of GCIP Ukraine platform for conducting the cleantech Accelerator programme across selected SME clusters in Kiev, Ukraine

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

The activities of the project included five (5) other regions/universities (regional accelerator centers for innovation, technology, and start-ups) as follow:

- Kherson region (Kherson National Technical University): 46.6486 / 32.6083
- Donetsk region in Slovyansk town (Donbas State Pedagogical University): 46.84 / 35.37
- Mykolayiv region (Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University): 46.9716 / 32.0151
- Ivano-Frankivsk region (Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University): 48.9152 / 24.7012
- Sumy region (Sumy State University): 50.9068 / 34.7992



## EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023.
2. **Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the Division Chief and Director.
3. **Evaluation:** For the report to be used effectively as a tool for annual self-evaluation, project counterparts need to be fully involved. The (main) counterpart can provide any additional information considered essential, including a simple rating of project progress.
4. **Results-based management:** The annual project/programme progress reports are required by the RBM programme component focal points to obtain information on outcomes observed.

Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) ratings	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <u>all</u> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its <u>major</u> global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its major <u>relevant</u> objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modes overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <u>some</u> of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <u>achieve only some</u> of its major global environmental objectives.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected <u>not</u> to achieve <u>most</u> of its major global environmental objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <u>any</u> of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Implementation of <u>all</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Implementation of <u>most</u> components in <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	Implementation of <u>none</u> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.