



Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	Low-carbon economy of Ukraine for climate change prevention: Facilitating investment to scale-up innovative cleantech solutions for low carbon economy and climate action
GEF ID:	10454
UNIDO ID:	190025
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-7
Country(ies):	Ukraine
Region:	ECA - Europe and Central Asia
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs¹:	IF applicable, please select: n/a IAP – Commodities, IAP – Cities or IAP – Food Security
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Global Cleantech Innovation Programme
Implementing Department/Division:	ENE / CTI
Co-Implementing Agency:	n/a
Executing Agency(ies):	Greencubator – no execution agreement between Greencubator and UNIDO has been signed yet due to war-related difficulties in communication
Project Type:	Medium-Sized Project (MSP)
Project Duration:	60 months
Extension(s):	N/A
GEF Project Financing:	USD 1,307,500.00
Agency Fee:	USD 117,675.00
Co-financing Amount:	USD 10,515,400.00
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	11/24/2021
UNIDO Approval Date:	12/7/2021
Actual Implementation Start:	12/31/2021
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:	USD 0
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	Difficult to determine due to the war in Ukraine, as a result of which the project execution agreement with Greencubator has not been signed and the project activities have not been kicked off yet. It is expected that the project execution agreement could be signed this

¹ Only for GEF-6 projects, if applicable

	year.
Original Project Completion Date:	12/31/2026
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	n/a
Current SAP Completion Date:	12/31/2026
Expected Project Completion Date:	Difficult to determine due to reasons mentioned above.
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	Difficult to determine due to reasons mentioned above.
Expected Financial Closure Date:	Difficult to determine due to reasons mentioned above.
UNIDO Project Manager²:	Olga Rataj

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective
<p>The aim of the project is to accelerate cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship by SMEs and start-ups and to strengthen the cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem of Ukraine.</p> <p>GCIP Ukraine has three components, in line with the GCIP Framework, which have been designed based on the current needs of developing countries, including Ukraine, as well as recommendations from the GEF's independent evaluation of GCIP conducted in 2018, and with feedback from the previous nine GCIP country projects implemented between 2013 and 2019.</p> <p>As part of the GCIP Framework, the GCIP Ukraine receives support from the GCIP global coordination child project (GEF ID: 10461), further referred to as GCIP Global. More specifically, it is supported by global project executing entities (global PEEs), including the Network for Global Innovation (NGIN), the Cleantech Group (CTG), the Private Financing Advisory Network (PFAN), and UNIDO.</p> <p>In particular, the project will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Transform early-stage innovative cleantech solutions into scalable enterprises; <p>The focus is on early-stage innovative cleantech solutions and provision of acceleration support related to entrepreneurship and business skills training. In addition, targeted technical assistance will be offered to the start-ups/SMEs that were accelerated and have traction and sales evidence, but which still need specialized enterprise growth support. Furthermore, a start-ups/SMEs in the expansion stage will receive tipping-point investment facilitation services to raise investment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Strengthen the capacities of cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem (CIEE) stakeholders and connect them; <p>Activities are designed to maximize the impact of GCIP by strengthening national cleantech ecosystems of GCIP partner countries, identifying synergies across national ecosystems, and connecting ecosystems for knowledge exchange and partnership building. At the national child project level, development of policies and regulations to promote cleantech innovation will be prioritized.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Engage with the GCIP global coordination child project to ensure programme coordination and coherence; <p>In order to maintain coherence and standards of GCIP execution across multiple countries, GCIP guidelines will be developed under the GCIP Global and disseminated as a tool for national child projects for adaptation and adoption.</p>

Baseline
<p>In order to shift markets towards low-carbon economy, there is a need for full engagement in mobilising the private sector to leverage innovation, knowledge transfer, investment and market access. In this context, it also needs to be noted that the widespread adoption and utilization of innovative cleantech has significant potential to address the serious environmental problems and risks faced globally. Cleantech innovations can fuel the next industrial revolution that will shape tomorrow's global economy, environment,</p>

² Person responsible for report content

and job market. The SMEs/start-ups are supposed to play a vital role in catalyzing breakthrough cleantech innovations.

SMEs/start-ups are well positioned to participate in future cleantech markets. They play an instrumental (but often under recognized) role in furthering growth, innovation, and development. Coupled with a growing cleantech sector, they can help build prosperity in low- and middle-income countries. It is estimated that SMEs makeup over 90% of cleantech entrepreneurial endeavors in most countries. Nevertheless, failure rates are high, capital requirements are a barrier, reliance on government policy is a risk, and the technical and commercial capacity required of cleantech SMEs can be a challenge. Despite opportunities for SMEs in cleantech markets, many businesses still fail.

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 management³, 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.

Overall Ratings ⁴	FY23	FY22
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Due to the war in Ukraine, one of the selected project executing entities (NRFU) resigned from participation in the project. The second selected executing entity (Greencubator) agreed to take over the activities and budget (amounting to only USD 100,000) of NRFU, but the project execution agreement has not yet been signed, due to difficulties in communication between UNIDO and Greencubator that result from the war, and the project activities have not been kicked off yet. There is an initial positive indication from Greencubator to progress with the project.		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Due to the war in Ukraine, one of the selected project executing entities (NRFU) resigned from participation in the project. The second selected executing entity (Greencubator) agreed to take over the activities and budget (amounting to only USD 100,000) of NRFU, but the project execution agreement has not yet been signed, due to difficulties in communication between UNIDO and Greencubator that result from the war, and the project activities have not been kicked off yet. There is an initial positive indication from Greencubator to progress with the project.		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>High Risk (H)</i>	<i>High Risk (H)</i>
It is difficult to foresee how the crisis in Ukraine will unfold. At the moment, the overall risk ranking is perceived as high.		

³ 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

⁴ 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

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.

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicator ¹	Bas e-line	Target (for the entire project duration)	Progress in FY23
Objective To accelerate investments in and uptake of low carbon and clean technologies in Ukraine by supporting the development of innovative green financial and market mechanism for SMEs	USD mln investment leveraged	0	2	No progress in FY23
	number of enterprises with economic gains (sales, savings)	0	15 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of additional jobs created or retained	0	30 (at least 35% women employed)	
	number of enterprises with an increase in exports	0	5-10 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of SMEs with increased inclusion in value chains	0	10-15 (at least 35% women-led)	
	CO ₂ eq emissions reduced (tons) directly and indirectly	0	at least 126,000 (directly) at least 630,000 (indirectly)	
	MW added generation capacity	0	n/a ²	
	cumulative improved energy efficiency	0	40	
Component 1 Transforming early-stage innovative cleantech solutions into commercial enterprises				
Outcome 1.1 Start-ups and SMEs are supported in advanced and gender-responsive business growth				
Output 1.1.1 The GCIP guidebooks are adapted for the GCIP 2 Ukraine	number of suggestions for improvement of the GCIP guidebooks	0	5-10	No progress in FY23
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine gender-responsive guidebooks for Advanced Accelerator and Post-Accelerator	0	2 (1 for Advanced Accelerator, 1 for Post-Accelerator)	
	number of consultation sessions on GCIP 2 Ukraine guidebooks with relevant CIEE stakeholders	0	2	
	number of stakeholders with whom the GCIP 2 Ukraine guidebooks shared	0	800-1000 (at least 35% women)	

Output 1.1.2	number of suggestions for improvement of the GCIP cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship expert training and certification system	0	5-10	
Pool of at least 10 cleantech financing and investment experts is trained to support the GCIP 2 Ukraine (at least 35% women)	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship expert training and certification systems number of trainings provided to experts number of participants per one expert training number of experts evaluated number of experts accredited share of cleantech financing and investment experts that completed the "I know-gender" training and the gender-lens investment online-training modules	0	2 (1 for trainers, 1 for mentors) 2 (1 for trainers, 1 for mentors) 5 (at least 35% women) 20 (at least 35% women) 10 (at least 35% women) 100%	
Output 1.1.3 Advanced acceleration services are provided to at least 15 SMEs/start-ups (at least 35% women-led)	number of SMEs/start-ups participating in the GCIP 2 Ukraine Advanced Accelerator	0	15 (at least 35% women-led)	No progress in FY23
	number of SMEs/start-ups with international market expansion (i.e. technology collaboration, product co-development, joint venture etc.)	0	5 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine alumni with access to the i3 database	0	30 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine alumni nominated for support by the GCIP Global Accelerator	0	2 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of global engagement strategies	0	1	
	number of global engagement workshops	0	2	
	share of women among the workshop participants	0	35%	
Output 1.1.4 At least 40 SMEs/start-ups with innovative cleantech solutions receive post-acceleration and investment facilitation support (at least 35% women-led)	number of cycles of GCIP 2 Ukraine Post-Accelerator		4	
	number of SMEs/start-ups participating in the GCIP 2 Ukraine Post-Accelerator	0	40 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine Post-Accelerator enterprises provided with needs-based support	0	15 (at least 35% women-led)	
	number of enterprises provided with technology verification, product development and testing facility support	0	15 (at least 35% women-led)	

	number of targeted support activities for products/services that promote gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW)	0	3-5	
	number of targeted support activities for women entrepreneurs	0	3-5	
	number of Investor Connect events organized	0	5	
Outcome 1.2 Investment is mobilized to deploy innovative cleantech solutions across various sectors				
	number of financial institutions and funds with which contacts established	0	10	No progress in FY23
	number of gender-responsive awareness raising events for investor community	0	3-5	
	number of investors (representatives of commercial banks, investment funds, public/private companies, as well as individuals, etc.) participating in the awareness raising events	0	10-15 (at least 35% women)	
	number of trainings for local financial experts	0	3-5	
	share of women financial experts participating in the trainings	0	35%	
	number of events organized/attended to encourage seed funding providers to participate in the GCIP 2 Ukraine	0	3-5	
	number of trainings on gender-lens investment or gender sensitization for investors	0	3-5	
Output 1.2.1 Financing mechanism tailored for investments in innovative cleantech solutions is designed, validated and operationalized (up to 30 SMEs/start-ups receive seed funding and at least 35% women-led)	number of relevant stakeholders engaged in the design process of the financing mechanism	0	10 (at least 35% women)	No progress in FY23
	number of stakeholders engaged in the design process of the financing mechanism that promote GEEW	0	at least 1	
	number of SMEs/start-ups that receive seed-funding through financing mechanism	0	20-30 (at least 35% women-led)	
	USD mln disbursed per year	0	0,4	
	number of stakeholders making financial contributions to the mechanism	0	6	
	number of mechanisms designed, validated and	0	1 (including eligibility criteria, thematic	

	operationalized		focus, etc.)	
Component 2 Cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem (CIEE) strengthening and connectivity				
Outcome 2.1 Policy and regulatory framework is strengthened to stimulate investments in innovative cleantech solutions				
Output 2.1.1 Recommendations for	number of gender-responsive policy recommendations to close the financing gap for cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship	0	3-5	No progress in FY23
enhancement of the policy and regulatory framework and a roadmap for their implementation are developed and validated	number of stakeholder engagement workshops	0	1	No progress in FY23
	number of participants in the stakeholder engagement workshops	0	20 (at least 35% women)	
	number of gender-responsive roadmaps guiding implementation of the policy recommendations	0	1	
	number of stakeholders engaged in the development of policy recommendations and roadmaps that promote GEEW	0	at least 1	
Outcome 2.2 Institutional capacity building of the cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem (CIEE) actors is conducted				
Output 2.2.1 2.2.1 Capacity of national institutions (at least 6) is strengthened to coordinate, streamline, and accelerate investments into cleantech solutions (at least 35% women participants)	number of capacity building events for selected stakeholders	0	5	No progress in FY23
	number of participants in the stakeholder capacity building events	0	30-50 (at least 35% women)	
	number of stakeholders that completed the "I know-gender" training and the gender-lens investment online training modules	0	35-45	
	number of relevant institutions strengthened through capacity building activities on managing and promoting innovative cleantech investments	0	6	
Component 3 Knowledge management, project monitoring and evaluation, and programme coordination and coherence				
Outcome 3.1 Efficiency and sustainability of the GCIP 2 Ukraine is ensured through programme coordination and coherence with other GCIP country projects				

Output 3.1.1 The GCIP internal guidelines for project management teams are adapted and implemented by the GCIP 2 Ukraine	number of gender-responsive tools/books (with operational guidelines for the PMU)	0	1	No progress in FY23
	number of sustainability and exit strategies	0	1	
Output 3.1.2 Knowledge exchange is facilitated among CIEE actors at national and global levels implemented by the GCIP 2 Ukraine	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine gender-responsive knowledge management, communication, and advocacy strategies	0	1	
	number of policy briefs, impact reports, brochures, webinars, and other types of promotional materials disseminated through briefing sessions, press releases, social media	0	200-300 (at least 40% featuring women entrepreneurs and/or the relevance of GEEW in cleantech)	
	presence and advertising, etc. (in line with the GCIP 2 Ukraine knowledge management, communication, and advocacy strategy)			No progress in FY23
	number of memorandums of understanding (MoUs)/cooperation agreements	0	15-20	
	number of targeted outreach and promotion communications to women	0	3-5	
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine web platforms	0	1	
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine alumni networks	0	1	
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine alumni women's chapter in the networks	0	1	
	number of members in the GCIP 2 Ukraine alumni network	0	100-150 (at least 35% women)	
	number of national forums/workshops that promote GCIP 2 Ukraine achievements and showcase its participants	0	2	
% of knowledge products and promotion materials that is gender-responsive	0	100%		
Outcome 3.2 Impacts and progress of the GCIP 2 Ukraine are tracked and reported				
Output 3.2.1 The GCIP methodology for impact assessment is adapted and applied	number of trainings on the GCIP methodology for impact assessment	0	3	
	number of participants in trainings on the GCIP methodology for impact assessment	0	30-90 (at least 35% women)	

Output 3.2.2 Project activities are tracked and reported, as well as the external mid-term review and independent terminal evaluation are conducted	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine impact reports	0	5	No progress in FY23
	number of GCIP 2 Ukraine monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans	0	1	
	number of project progress reports (including monitoring of ESMP, Gender Action Plan, risks & SEP)	0	10	
	number of external mid-term review reports	0	1	
	number of independent external terminal evaluation reports	0	1	

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.

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

	(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 ⁵
1	Limited interest in the GCIP 2 Ukraine Advance d Accelerator and Post-Accelerator support	Medium	Medium	<p>The GCIP 1 Ukraine Accelerator has been successful and received a high number of applications. The proposed project will leverage on this existing success and awareness.</p> <p>Outreach and communications activities will be a key component of the GCIP 2 Ukraine in the lead-up to the opening of application process and throughout the project to attract entrepreneurs, potential sponsors, partners, and experts. More specifically, the GCIP 2 Ukraine knowledge management, communication, and advocacy strategy will be developed to guide these efforts.</p>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Macroeconomic/country risk	High	High	<p>Deterioration in the macroeconomic and political situation in Ukraine might have an adverse effect on GCIP 2 Ukraine. However, in 2019 Ukraine's economy remained steady. The real GDP has remained steady over the recent years. The economic growth rate in 2019 corresponded to the National Bank's estimate published in the January 2020 Inflation Report (3.3%). Domestic demand, both consumer and investment, has remained the main driver of economic growth. Standard & Poor's and Fitch's credit ratings for Ukraine stand at B with stable outlook.</p>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Lack of political support and enabling environment for innovative cleantech	Medium	Medium	<p>Ukraine has made significant strides in building up its innovation capacities. In general, in novation and entrepreneurship are high on the governmental agenda, which is e.g. evidenced by the establishment of the SFII and USF. Within Component 2 of GCIP 2 Ukraine, there will be focus on further strengthening of the policy and institutional framework to promote the</p>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁵ New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.

				CIEE together with the Government of Ukraine. Advocacy and awareness raising activities will be an integral part of the project to support the development of a conducive policy and regulatory environment. What is more, the GCIP 1 Ukraine has already facilitated improvement of the enabling environment, which the GCIP 2 Ukraine will further build on		
4	Sustainability risk	Medium	Medium	A GCIP 2 Ukraine sustainability and exit strategy will be developed based on a framework delivered by the GCIP Global, and it will among others include specific considerations related to a formal project handover process and the point in time when UNIDO's exit takes place (based on targets achieved by the GCIP 2 Ukraine). What is more, links are being established with GCIP 1 Ukraine to strengthen the coordination between GCIP 1 Ukraine and GCIP 2 Ukraine as to ensure an uninterrupted support provided to enterprises along their scale-up journey. Also, a financing mechanism will be established in the framework of GC	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Lack of interest by mentors and trainers	Medium	Medium	The GCIP 1 Ukraine has trained mentors/trainers/judges and attracted experts to support the Accelerator. It is also cooperating with leading universities across the country. It is expected that the GCIP 2 Ukraine will be equally successful in attracting GCIP experts from a variety of sectors and providing them with skills necessary to support the Advanced Accelerator and Post-Accelerator services. Also, links will be built with PFAN that has already established a network of coaches, from whose involvement the GCIP 2 Ukraine could also potential benefit	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Lack of effective coordination between various project partners	Medium	Medium	Proper coordination will be sought through the PSC and ad-hoc working groups will be established if necessary. The project will also build upon networks built under the GCIP 1 Ukraine.		<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Insufficient incentive and financial support system	Medium	Medium	Linkages to other financing schemes for cleantech promotion and innovation will be established as early as possible. The GCIP 2 Ukraine will facilitate cross-fertilization between different similar		<input type="checkbox"/>

				<p>programmes and initiatives. Also, exposure of supported start-up/SME to regional and global investors and partners will be ensured.</p> <p>The outreach and communications activities will be targeted at, among others, financing institutions, venture capitalists, and angel investors.</p> <p>Moreover, the strong GCIP brand, and the direct involvement of renowned global PEEs are expected to build confidence of national and international financiers. The PSC will include at least one representative of a financing institution or an investor.</p>	None	
8	Low success rate of new innovative cleantech businesses	Medium	Medium	<p>The GCIP 2 Ukraine aims to promote the CIEE by identifying and nurturing cleantech innovators and entrepreneurs with skills required to develop and commercialize their innovations. The GCIP guidebooks (for Advanced Accelerator and Post-Accelerator) will be comprehensive documents that articulate the GCIP approach to promoting cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in developing countries. As such, they will help ensure that the businesses supported have real market potential. In particular, they will define eligibility requirements and selection criteria for the participants.</p> <p>What is more, GCIP 2 Ukraine will encourage applications from GCIP 1 Ukraine alumni, and as such at least some of the GCIP 2 Ukraine participants will have the GCIP 1 Ukraine trainings and acceleration support already accomplished, which could strengthen their success outlooks.</p>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Institutional risks (insufficient administrative, organizational and technical capacity of the national PEEs for successful execution of the project)	Low	Low	<p>Capacity building of the national PEEs will be an ongoing process throughout the project implementation period to ensure that staff are comprehensively trained and sustainability of GCIP 2 Ukraine is ensured.</p> <p>An organizational assessment of the national PEEs was conducted during the PPG phase to evaluate potential execution risks. The results showed the risks to be low/medium in all areas under consideration.</p>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>

10	Social and gender risks	Low	Low	To ensure gender inclusiveness of all project activities, UNIDO methodology for gender assessment and gender responsive communication showing the benefits of gender equality for both women and men will be applied. To mainstream women and youth entrepreneurship, adequate and gender responsive activities will be implemented and sensitization workshops will be organized. A full Gender Analysis Report was prepared and conclusions resulting from it were incorporated into the project design.	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Climate change risks	Low	Low	Climate change is not likely to have severe impacts on this project, with an exception for cleantech innovation dependent on biomass or water supplies. To safeguard against climate change risks, the screening of technologies to be supported by the GCIP 2 Ukraine will include an assessment of the climate risks with a time horizon of 30 years, and where a risk is identified it will be necessary for the entrepreneur to propose suitable adaptation or management measures. The GIZ's Climate Expert Tool could be used as a tool available to entrepreneurs in that context.	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Environmental risks	Medium	Medium	It is recognized that some technologies that could potentially be supported by the GCIP 2 Ukraine, such as the use of blockchain, could lead to major GHG emissions, unless powered entirely by renewable energy. Similarly, technologies related to energy storage can have harmful environmental impacts if not managed effectively. Therefore, any cleantech innovation supported by the GCIP 2 Ukraine will need to meet strict environmental screening criteria. In addition, an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) was prepared (Annex K) to mitigate the environmental (and social) risks.	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	War related risks	High	High	The project will operate in regions that are more politically stable and less prone to conflict. Diversifying locations can reduce the impact of war-related disruptions. Project contracts will include robust force majeure clauses	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

				that account for war-related events. The projects will prioritize the safety and well-being of the project's personnel. Evacuation plans and security training will be provided as necessary and employees will be kept informed about potential risks.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

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).

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

Please expand the table as needed.

	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			
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)			

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).

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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.).

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

VI. Gender Mainstreaming

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),.

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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.

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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.

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**⁶ 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	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	<i>The project kick-start is delayed due to the war. Yet, it is expected that the project execution agreement with Greencubator could be signed this year. After this, an updated implementation schedule will be prepared in coordination with Greencubator.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	

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

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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 nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

⁶ 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	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				GEF Grant Budget Available (US\$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Component 1 –													
Outcome 1:													
Output 1.1:													
Output 1.2:													
Component 2 –													
Outcome 2:													
Output 2.1:													
Output 2.2:													

X. Synergies

1. Synergies achieved:

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

3. Stories to be shared (Optional)

There is nothing to report on, since the project activities have not been kicked off yet.

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
Kyiv	50.450001	30.523333	703448	n/a

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

There is no project intervention yet.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

- Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023.
- Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the Division Chief and Director.
- 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.
- 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	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	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”.
Satisfactory (S)	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.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	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.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	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.
Unsatisfactory (U)	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.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	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)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	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”.
Satisfactory (S)	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.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	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.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components in <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	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:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.