

# Reducing barriers to promote electric mobility in the Republic of Belarus through the introduction of ultra-fast charging stations

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10421

**Countries**

Belarus

**Project Name**

Reducing barriers to promote electric mobility in the Republic of Belarus through the introduction of ultra-fast charging stations

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

8/17/2021

**Review completed by PM**

9/10/2021

**Program Manager**

Ming Yang

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF 7 CCM focal area strategy.

Agency Response

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

1. The objective as shown below has some weeds. Please revise it to make it concise.

"To remove barriers to the e-vehicle market in Belarus by removing barriers to help make e-vehicles more accessible to the population by changes to legislation, regulations, and policy. The Project will also make pilot investments to stimulate necessary infrastructure investments in the charging network leading to 152,090 tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> of direct greenhouse gas emission reductions, 2.854 million tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> over the lifetime of the investments, and consequential greenhouse gas emission reductions of 3.766 million tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> (top-down) and 0.304 million tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> (bottom-up)."

2. For outputs 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, please individually indicate the budget of each of them. It seems that Investment in three charging stations with \$12,040,000 is not cost-effective. Please elaborate the total number of chargers of the three charging stations. One single charger costs only a couple of thousand dollars. Please see the article with the following link please. Per the output description of the CEO AR as shown below, there will be only three chargers to be installed. Please double check the numbers and capacity of each charger and make sure they will be cost-effectively installed. Please justify why more than \$12 million is needed to build three charging stations with limited chargers.

[https://bollardcompany.com/ev-charging-station-1/?gclid=CjwKCAjw3\\_KIBhA2EiwAaAAliuHFBwD\\_b-cNebHoWOeaHmK-cM4hFwaKk41S5Aqk7mGo39as3VS1nxoCr78QAvD\\_BwE](https://bollardcompany.com/ev-charging-station-1/?gclid=CjwKCAjw3_KIBhA2EiwAaAAliuHFBwD_b-cNebHoWOeaHmK-cM4hFwaKk41S5Aqk7mGo39as3VS1nxoCr78QAvD_BwE)

*Output 2.2: Installation of at least 3 Super-Fast Charging Station(s) (300+kW) to compliment the charging infrastructure network of Belarus.* By Q1 of Year 3 (2024), selection of the suppliers for a minimum of 3 pilot super-fast charging stations (the number of super-fast charging stations may increase) will have been selected for installation. MoNREP will manage the Project budget for procurement of the super-fast charging stations and the tendering process for the selection of the 3 chargers with the assistance of Belorusneft, and provide staff to oversee its installation. Later, the Project will support Belorusneft to procure and install the 25 super-charging stations with the know-how gathered from the Project.

3. The PMC is not proportionally budgeted from the GEF grant and the co-financing. See below.

1,195,010	12,166,000
102,935	1,130,000
8.6%	9.3%

Please revise the budget and make the two shares identical. This is to avoid possible additional comments from my PPO colleagues.

4. In Table B, please indicate the names of the stakeholders who will execute the relevant activities for the individual outputs.

9/10/2021 PM:

Cleared.

9/15/2021 PM

No. Please address the following comments:

1. Project Information: The Project information section of the CEO Endorsement states that the project duration amounts to 48 months. If this is correct, please update the expected date to 12/31/2015 (instead of 12/31/2016). Keep consistency between the project duration and the project's expected completion date.

2. On the Budget:

- Please align the numbers in the table so all the numbers appear in one line.

- The salary of the Project Manager has been charged across the components and the PMC. Please also note that as per GEF Project Guidelines *“If project staff are charged to both PMC and project components (i.e. not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat”*. On the TORs for the Project Manager provided in the Agency ProDoc, please note that the described duties and responsibilities are mainly related with Management / Coordination ? we can't appreciate the detailed contribution to the project's components. If there is no contribution from the Project Manager to the specific components, please update the budget so the salary of the Project Coordinator is covered by the both the GEF and the co-financing portions of the PMC.

10/12/2021 MY:

1. The project duration has been revised from 48 to 60 per an email from the UNDP. See the newly uploaded email documents.

2. The UNDP also addressed the budget issues.

## Agency Response

UNDP, 09/09/2021:

Thanks for the detailed assessment and suggestions under this section. Below, we provided details on changes made in the project and further clarifications where needed.

1. The Project Objective has been revised to be more concise. The below new version has been used in CEO AR and Prodoc.

*To remove barriers in e-vehicle market in Belarus to help make e-vehicles more accessible to the population by changes to legislation, regulations, and policy, leading to 152,090 tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> of direct greenhouse gas emission reductions, and 3.766 million tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> (top-down) and 0.304 million tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> (bottom-up) consequential greenhouse gas emission reductions.*

2.

a. The budget items for outputs 2.1 to 2.3 are now presented separately in Table B as respective to the "technical assistance" whereas the output 2.2 corresponds to the "investment".

b. The Project aims to establish 28 super-fast charging stations of which at least 3 will be purchased with GEF resources and 25 with the Belarusneft co-financing. In order to make this clear, an additional sentence has been added to the Output 2.2. in Table B.

*(Additional 25 charging stations to be installed by Belarusneft as co-financing)*

c. The project aims to deploy "DC super-fast charging stations" with charging capacities higher than 300 kW (average conventional DC fast charging stations that are currently available for EVs have charging capacities between 50kW to 150kW with lower prices). The super-fast charging stations are high performance equipment with one stall having two charging spots most of the time. The associated costs vary between \$140,000 and \$200,000 currently and additional costs for the installation by the service provider company and/or utility may be needed. The exact amount of charging stations to be procured with the GEF resources will be defined after the feasibility studies carried out by the project, under Output 2.1. In case the prices are lower than current estimates at the time of implementation, the Project Team will present to the Project Board alternative options including purchasing more charging stations with associated Project budget. The Project Board will then decide on procurement content, based on the cost-effectiveness principles of the GEF and UNDP. The details of this mechanism is provided in section 3) "The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcome and components of the Project". Finally, the total of \$12 million will cover the costs associated with at least 3 charging stations to be purchased by the GEF Project, and 25 super-fast charging stations to be procured by Belarusneft as a co-finance. Belarusneft will also continue deploying mode 4 and mode 3 charging stations which are also part of co-financing provided by the organization.

Two references are provided below for the current super-fast charging station costing:

Reference 1: Property Manager's web-page.

<https://www.propertymanagerinsider.com/how-much-do-commercial-dc-fast-chargers-cost-2/>

Reference 2: The International Council on Clean Transportation (Please see Public DCFC ? 350kW)

Charging Type	Labor	EVSE hardware	Other materials, permits, taxes	Total
Home L2 - Single-family detached *	\$583	\$391	\$-	\$974
Home L2 - Single-family attached *	\$2,027	\$400	\$-	\$2,428
Home L2 - Multi-family	\$3,345	\$512	\$-	\$3,857
Workplace L2	\$1,435	\$1,488	\$900	\$3,823
Public L2	\$1,579	\$1,817	\$1,110	\$4,507
Public DCFC - 350kW	\$15,963	\$141,907	\$15,422	\$173,292
Depot L2 - LDV	\$1,435	\$951	\$900	\$3,286

Source: Atlas analysis of cost data from The International Council on Clean Transportation, 2019

Charging Type	Labor	EVSE hardware	Other materials, permits, taxes	Total
Home L2 - Single-family detached *	\$583	\$391	\$-	\$974
Home L2 - Single-family attached *	\$2,027	\$400	\$-	\$2,428
Home L2 - Multi-family	\$3,345	\$512	\$-	\$3,857
Workplace L2	\$1,435	\$1,488	\$900	\$3,823
Public L2	\$1,579	\$1,817	\$1,110	\$4,507
Public DCFC - 350kW	\$15,963	\$141,907	\$15,422	\$173,292
Depot L2 - LDV	\$1,435	\$951	\$900	\$3,286

Source: Atlas analysis of cost data from The International Council on Clean Transportation, 2019

3. The PMC budget has been revised to have approximately the same percentages for GEF and co-finance amounts. The co-financing amount for Outcome 2 as an investment is now increased and PMC is decreased in Table B.

1,195,010	12,246,000
102,935	1,050,000
1,297,945	13,296,000
8.61%	8.57%

4. All project activities will be executed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, including the procurement of super-fast charging stations. The charging stations will then be transferred to Belorusneft. For the activities under Outcome 2, close collaboration will be sought with Belorusneft, the Belarussian organization that is responsible from deployment and management of charging infrastructure in the country. To clarify this point, additional information has been inserted to the outputs 2.1, 2.2., and 2.3 in Table B:

*(This output will be executed in close collaboration with Belorusneft)*

UNDP, 09/29/2021

1. In Belarus, the registration of projects by the Government authorities starts after the project signature which takes about one year, and the project activities are not allowed to start before the completion of the registration process. Hence, this process causes almost one year delay in the project implementation for all GEF financed projects in Belarus which results in getting into extra process of extension request. To avoid this barrier, the project duration is increased from 4 years to 5 years, with the limited implementation in the first year. So that, the project will practically start in Year 2 when the registration process will take place in Year 1. This explanation is given in the cover page of Prodoc and Part II of CEO AR (page 6).

Although, the GEF Portal let us to revise the project start and end dates, there is no access to revise the "Duration" section by the Agency, which is highlighted in the screenshot, below.

We're kindly asking the Secretariat's assistance to update the "Duration" section as "60" months.

## Part I: Project Information

Name of Parent Program

GEF ID

10421

Project Type

MSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT

NGI

Project Title

Reducing barriers to promote electric mobility in the Republic of Belarus through the introduction of ultra-fast charging stations

Countries

Belarus,

Agency(ies)

UNDP,

Other Executing Partner ⓘ

Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Climate Change

Duration

48

In Months

Agency Fee (\$)

Taxonomy ⓘ

2.1. The budget in GEF format in Annex E in the GEF Portal is now aligned.

2.2. The term of reference (ToR) of the Project Manager has been revised to clearly indicate the technical content with linkages to the Project components. Please refer to Annex 10 of the Project Document (pages 96 and 97). The revised ToR of the Project Manager is also presented below with yellow highlight emphasising the changes.

### **Terms of Reference for the Project Manager**

*The PM will be responsible for the overall management of the project including the mobilization of all project inputs, supervision over project staff, consultants and sub-contractors. The PM will provide substantive technical input into components 1, 2 and 3.*

### **PM Duties and Responsibilities**

- ? *Manage the overall conduct of the project;*
- ? *Plan the activities of the project and monitor progress against the approved workplan;*
- ? *Execute activities by managing personnel, goods and services, training and low-value grants, including drafting terms of reference and work specifications, and overseeing all contractors' work;*



- ? Monitor events as determined in the project monitoring plan, and update the plan as required;
- ? Provide support for completion of assessments required by UNDP, spot checks and audits;
- ? Manage requests for the provision of UNDP financial resources through funding advances, direct payments or reimbursement using the FACE form;
- ? Monitor financial resources and accounting to ensure the accuracy and reliability of financial reports;
- ? Monitor progress, watch for plan deviations and make course corrections when needed within project board-agreed tolerances to achieve results;
- ? Ensure that changes are controlled, and problems addressed;
- ? Perform regular progress reporting to the project board as agreed with the board, including measures to address challenges and opportunities;
- ? Prepare and submit financial reports to UNDP on a quarterly basis;
- ? Manage and monitor the project risks ? including social and environmental risks - initially identified and submit new risks to the Project Board for consideration and decision on possible actions if required; update the status of these risks by maintaining the project risks log;
- ? Capture lessons learned during project implementation;
- ? Prepare revisions to the multi-year workplan, as needed, as well as annual and quarterly plans if required;
- ? Prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop;
- ? Ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the GEF PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the GEF PIR;
- ? Prepare the GEF PIR;
- ? Assess major and minor amendments to the project within the parameters set by UNDP-NCE;
- ? Monitor implementation plans including the gender action plan, stakeholder engagement plan, and any environmental and social management plans;
- ? Monitor and track progress against the GEF Core indicators;
- ? Support the Mid-term review and Terminal Evaluation process.
- ? Provide technical input to the project components with the below tasks:

#### For Component 1.

- ? Lead the team of experts working on the development of a national policy framework on sustainable transport including measures for the promotion of mobility and future management of operation and maintenance.
- ? Provide technical input for draft program documents on national policy for sustainable transport promoting e- mobility, and its proper operation and maintenance. Also, draft proposals for amendments to regulatory and legal acts resulting from the development and adoption of program documents.
- ? Consolidate input from national experts and lead consultations with national partners on the draft documents.
- ? Lead consultations with Belarusian counterparts on draft proposals for stimulating the purchase of e-Vehicles from the budget.

#### For Component 2.

- ? Lead assessment of proposed locations (cities and specific locations within cities) where super- fast charging stations can have a maximum demonstrative effect.

- ? Conduct consultation with the key national and local stakeholders on the proposed locations and develop a list of proposed locations with detailed justification.
- ? Prepare documents on the super-fast charging stations locations to be discussed at and approved by the Project Board.
- ? Lead the gathering of super-fast charging station performance data, its analysis and report preparation, including recommendations on further development of super-fast charging stations in Belarus.

**For Component 3.**

- ? Ensure preparation of a Communication Plan.
- ? Lead the project PR and awareness raising activities.
- ? Facilitate the development and constant updating of the project website.
- ? Liaise with national stakeholders on creation and operation of a national platform with up-to-date information the latest news on e-mobility in Belarus.
- ? Develop a system for monitoring, reporting and verification of GHG emission reductions from the project activities. Present the system to the Project Board for approval. Ensure the respective data is regularly collected and reported.
- ? With expert support, elaborate on Gender Action Plan and ensure its implementation and regular update. Include gender perspectives into annual reporting and presentations to the Project Board.
- ? Collect information and prepare a project Lessons-learned Report and present it to Project Board.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Not completed.

The co-financing letter from Belorusneft shows the following: "Co-financing in cash will amount to the equivalent of 12.3 million US dollars and will be fulfilled within the framework of the Comprehensive Program for the Development of Electric Transport for 2021-2025, approved by the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus on April 9, 2021 No. 213 and will be directed to the development of charging infrastructure for electric transport." Please change "Equity Investment" into "Cash" in Table C to make the term consistent. Please also elaborate how the \$12.3 million cash will be spent with the proposed GEF project (See the comments under question No. 2 above.)

9/10/2021 PM:

Cleared.

9/15/2021 PM

No. Please address the following comments:

Co-financing:

- Please clarify whether Belorusneft shall be categorized as "Recipient Country Government". Although it is a "state-owned" company, we checked their website (<https://www.belorusneft.by/sitebeloil/en/addUp/about/history/>) and it does look like this should be more categorized as Private Sector. Please clarify and update accordingly.

-As per the Co-financing letters it seems that the EU4climate project is funded by the European Union, in which case the category should be Donor Country. But the end of the letter it stipulates that "Overall total UNDP co-financing is 676,000 USD". This would imply that the category should be GEF Agency. Also it's not clear whether this co-financing is a grant. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

10/12/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP, 09/09/2021:

Table C has been revised to reflect Belarusneft's cash contribution.

Also, co-financing of Belarusneft will be used for 25 super-fast charging stations that will be installed using the experience gathered from the pilot charging stations. Investments in these 25 super-fast charging stations is assessed as 6,000,000-6,500,000 USD. In addition, the co-financing will be used for the installation of 386 charging stations of Mode 4 and 80 charging stations of Mode 3 till the end of 2025 that will require approximately 6,000,000 USD investments.

UNDP, 09/29/2021

1. Thank you for highlighting this issue. The category of Belarusneft has been changed to Private Sector in Table C (co-finance table) of CEO AR (page 3).
2. The UNDP co-finance letter has been renewed and attached to the project package (uploaded to the GEF Portal). The new Letter indicates that the co-finance from EU4Climate project is in the form of Grant. Also, the new letter includes a supporting document as an annex for the EU4Climate Project. Finally, the category of co-financing has been changed to GEF Agency in the table under Table C of CEO AR (page 3). The co-finance table at CEO AR, Table C has been revised accordingly.

## GEF Resource Availability

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is adequate.

## Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, Annex C is attached to the CEO AR document.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?  
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes. Section F shows the core indicator targets in a table.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems,  
including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes. It is elaborated in Section 1a. Project Description.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects  
were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is elaborated on the section of 2) The baseline scenario and any associated  
baseline projects:.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is elaborated on the section of 3) The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the project is aligned with GEF 7 CCM focal area.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is elaborated in the Section of 5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is elaborated in Section 6 of the CEO AR document.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is elaborated in Section 7 of the CEO AR document.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the map is attached to Annex E of the CEO AR document.

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the**

**implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the stakeholder engagement plan is attached to Annex J but more work needs to be done.

1. Please put the names of project stakeholders to match the outputs of the project in Table B. In the description of project components, please indicate which organizations or project stakeholders will execute the sub-components of capital investments for technology demonstrations.
2. Please elaborate whether this project will benefit or impact any Indigenous or minority Peoples and Local Communities. If so, please show evidence that they have been consulted with the project impacts. Please indicate which stakeholders will be affected by the project on ground and how they have been consulted.
3. Please include information about the future roles of stakeholders and proposed means of future engagement. Please check if the future roles of stakeholders have been identified. Please demonstrate how the project keeps engaging stakeholders through adequate means.

9/10/2021 PM:

Cleared.

### Agency Response

UNDP, 09/09/2021:

1. All project activities will be executed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection including the procurement of super-fast charging stations. Also, all project outputs under Outcome 2 will be executed by the Ministry in close collaboration with Belarusneft. Additional text has been inserted to Table B for outputs 2.1, 2.2. and 2.3 to highlight the specific role of Belarusneft.
2. There are no indigenous people in Belarus as also set out in Annex K ? Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), Part B, Question 5. The project will have specific measures to involve the local people who may have benefits or impact from the charging stations to be installed in various places. This will be ensured right after the definition of provisional pilot sites for charging stations based on the initial feasibility



studies (Output 2.1). Such measures are defined in the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) as Annex O of the CEO AR.

Also, additional text has been added to CEO AR, 2. Stakeholders Section to clarify this point:

*UNDP does not anticipate that any stakeholders will be adversely affected by the Project. Nevertheless, risks associated with this Project have been identified, their impact and probability have been assessed and mitigation measures have been devised to minimize their probability of occurrence and impact in accordance with UNDP's Atlas Risk Register and its Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) report and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) annex provided with this document. Project communication and grievance redressal mechanisms have been described in ESMF and will be operationalized during Project implementation. The project will identify the provisional pilot sites for the 3 super-fast charging station demonstrations. The local people who may be impacted or may benefit from these pilot works will be consulted by the project. Details of engagement with the local people around pilot sites are described in the ESMF.*

3. The future roles of stakeholders are detailed in Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Annex J of the CEO AR. Also, additional text has been provided in 2. Stakeholders section:

*The most important project beneficiary and stakeholder is the Government of Belarus, particularly MoNREP. As National Implementing Partner, MoNREP is directly engaged in all aspects of Project design and implementation. Belarusneft are also involved in Project planning and activity and will be a key institution during implementation as well. The roles of other project partners and key stakeholders are defined in Annex J ? Stakeholder Engagement Plan.*

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the analysis is presented in the section of 3. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* and Annex F.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes. The private sector engagement is elaborated in the section of *4. Private Sector Engagement*.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Please take into account all possible risks from economical, social, financial, technical, and environmental sectors. For example, any co-financers may default their co-financing commitments. Please use a take to list all these risks and possible impacts on this project, and put measures to mitigate these risks.

Please undertake/update a/the detailed analysis on the risk and impact of climate change on this project. This can include:

1. Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations, which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc.).
  - 1.1 please include time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050).
  - 1.2 please look at list of examples from STAP guidance.
2. Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above. This means elaborating a narrative that describes how the climate scenarios indicated above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050.

3. Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and climate risk mitigation measures during PPG. Please see the STAP guidance.

Regarding the risk and impact due to COVID-19, more detailed work should be done per the following three questions:

1. General: Describe briefly how the pandemic overall is addressed in the project, including associated impacts, risks and opportunities. Projects are required to identify and establish likely impacts and risks from COVID-19, and how they will be dealt with in the context of delivering global environment benefits and climate adaptation and resilience benefits;

2. Risk analysis: Please consider any risks and measures to deal with the risks that are caused by COVID-19 and post-COVID-19. These risks include (1) availability of Technical Expertise and Capacity and Changes in Timelines in the selected provinces; and (2) any expected financing from the government and co-financing from all stakeholders. Please describe further how risks from COVID-19 have been analyzed and mitigation strategies incorporated into the design of this project. The PIF is expected to include consideration to the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of project design and eventual implementation.

3. Opportunity analysis: Describe further how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts (if any) caused by COVID-19 to deliver GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits, and contribute toward green recovery and building back better.

9/10/2021 PM:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, 09/09/2021:

1. Two more risks have been added to the Risk Register (i) Lack of willingness of project partners and key stakeholders as well as possible future bottlenecks resulting in poor collaboration environment and co-financing not materializing; and (ii) Lack of cooperation by private sector and finance institutions. These are presented in Annex G of CEO AR.

2. The analysis on possible impacts of climate change has been improved in the Risk section of CEO AR:

*Another risk is the Project's vulnerability to climate change. The project design team has assessed the risks related to changing climate and their possible effects on project implementation and results. The design team didn't come across with detailed assessments of possible climate impacts in Belarus that can be correlated with project*

interventions, namely deployment of charging stations. One of the resources that describes possible climate change impacts to different sectors is the 5<sup>th</sup> National Communication of Belarus, which mostly focuses on vulnerabilities and adaptation efforts around agriculture, forestry and water sectors as well as general conditions of humans. The report defines generic expected effects of climate change such as heats, humidity and diseases that might be introduced to the human population. Besides, the project design team has also listed risks that may be expected in Belarus due climate change and their possible impacts to the EV infrastructure that are given in the below table.

Risk	For the Republic of Belarus	For EV infrastructure
1. Landslides	Yes	No
2. Abrasion	Yes	No
3. Hurricanes, tornadoes, strong wind	Yes	Yes
4. Heat	Yes	No
5. Freezing	Yes	No
6. Flooding of the territory	Yes	Yes
7. Flood	Yes	No
8. Hail	Yes	No
9. Heavy precipitation	Yes	Yes
10. Ice formation	Yes	No

Systemic climate risks for EV infrastructure includes physical damage to production assets as a result of changes in weather conditions or natural disasters. The climatic risks of the territories are assessed according to the following risk sources: (i) atmosphere: very strong wind (including a hurricane, squall, tornado), drought, frost, abnormal heat (cold), large hail, abnormal precipitation, extremely high fire danger; (ii) hydrosphere: flooding (due to high water, congestion, catastrophic downpour, dam break), abrasion, processing of the shores of reservoirs, lakes, flat and gully erosion, channel deformations; (iii) cryosphere and lithosphere: avalanches, landslides, mudslides (including glacial ones), snow-white streams, thermal erosion, gully thermal erosion, thermokarst, heaving. According to the information gathered by the project design team, the charging stations have certain properties to mitigate any damage caused by such climatic events. Weather protection of connectors meets the requirements of IEC 61851-1 and has a degree of protection not lower than IP 54 (the degree of protection must be achieved in the connected and ready-to-work state). This degree of protection prevents serious damage to the equipment due to weather conditions. Thus, the impact on the charging infrastructure can only be exerted through the influence of weather factors on the entire electric power infrastructure.

In order to assess the future impacts of the climate change to the project interventions, the feasibility studies for the charging stations under Output 2.1 will cover analysis on possible effects of climate change to such products, and listing of precautions to be integrated to the procurement and establishment of charging stations by the project. Such information and know-how from the project will be available to Belorusneft for their future implementations too.

3. The analysis on risks and opportunities for Covid-19 has been improved and presented in Risk section of CEO AR:

The project design team has prepared this project under the circumstances posed by the Covid-19 pandemic which has caused the international project team leader not being

able to travel to Belarus. Also, at local level, efficiency of communication with the key project partners and stakeholders was lower than expected due to the limitations in face to face communication. These conditions have also affected the project preparation timelines and as a result, the GEF Operational Focal Point has asked for an extension of for the CEO submission deadline. Being part of such limitations, the project team has carefully assessed the possible future effects of COVID-19 and come up with some measures to respond back to those expected impacts. These include definition of a risk in Risk Register (Annex G) and mitigation approaches as well as integrating the COVID-19 aspects into the project design. For instance, the project team will ensure that COVID-19 considerations will be analyzed as part of project feasibility studies such as analysis on super-fast charging equipment providers and their possible limitations on providing the assets on time, and ensuring COVID-19 measures are in place for end-users of charging stations and international experts to contribute to the project will have all means to execute their duties in case there are limitations for visiting the project sites. (Please see output 2.1 and 2.2)

The COVID-19 may pose risks in the form of disruptions to implementation of Project activities such as procurement and import of the super-fast charging stations to Belarus which may slow down Project implementation, thereby causing Project delays and unable to meet its goals and targets in a timely manner. The project defines a specific risk for COVID-19 under Risk Register (Annex G). This risk foresees the following possible effects on (i) promotion of super-fast charging stations and local business development projects which enables a post-Covid green recovery, (ii) possible disruptions to implementation of Project activities causing the Project to be unable to meet its goals and targets in a timely manner; and (iii) any other limitations that cannot be forecast at this stage caused by COVID-19. Failure to addressing this risk may pose serious negative impacts to the project implementation. The project team will continuously assess the impact of COVID-19 in the areas related to the project context. This will commence in the inception period of the project and early findings and project measures to any rising COVID-19 related risks will be addressed with a participatory approach. These assessments will both evaluate the possible negative effects of COVID-19 as well as any opportunities raising.

On the other hand, the COVID-19 crisis may present some opportunities for the Project too. For instance, a key opportunity is to build significantly modern, low-carbon super-fast charging stations so that post-pandemic promotion of low-carbon technologies such as electromobility (while not increasing the use of harmful chemicals and ensuring the ability to recapture and recycle materials at the end of life), thereby promoting local business development projects which improves resilience to climate change and hence, enabling post-Covid green recovery in the country.

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is fully described in Section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination and Figure 3.

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is described in 7. *Consistency with National Priorities*.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented in Section 8. *Knowledge Management* with a time table.

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

It seems that the CEO AR does not include any Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) analysis and results.

1. Please ensure that the project document has provided the overall risk categorization (High/Substantial, Moderate/Medium, Low). Please check for appropriate justification.
2. Please confirm that the project document includes information on any measures to address ESS related risks and impacts during project implementation.
3. Please upload any available screening/assessment reports such as preliminary Environmental and Social Risk and Impact Assessment report(s).
4. Please consider social measures to deal with the impact of COVID-19 at local communities where the mining activities are conducted.

9/10/2021 PM:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, 09/09/2021:

1. The Overall social and environmental risk categorization (as per the SESP in Annex K) for this project is 'Substantial?'. This is now explained with an additional para in Risks section of CEO AR too:

*Furthermore, the Project Team has worked on the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and has identified the risk rating of Substantial. The SESP is presented in Annex K. Due to the Substantial risk category, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has also been prepared and attached to the project package. The Project will also prepare a stand alone Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) during the implementation before the piloting of super-fast charging station instalments which will describe how potential risks can be avoided or when avoidance is not possible, minimized, mitigated and managed. The main risk identified by the SESP is 'project leading to an increase in the use of EVs that needs disposal of certain vehicle components?'. The Project will respond to this risk by preparation of a roadmap (under Outputs 1.1 and 1.2) that will be following the SESA approach to ensure that socioeconomic implications of the road map have been taken into account and that environmentally and socially sound options for management of EV batteries and other components potentially containing hazardous material have been considered and addressed in line with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards.*

2. The detailed measures are described in the SESP (Annex K) and ESMF (Annex O).
3. The SESP is presented in Annex K of the CEO AR. Also, since the project is categorized as Substantial Risk, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared and annexed to the project package (Annex O). Moreover,

project activities under Output 2.1 and 2.2 have been revised to underline the environmental and social safeguard measures.

4. There is no mining activity associated with the project as its main focus is removing barriers for e-vehicles sector through pilot activities of installing charging stations as well as changes to policy, legislations and regulations. The electricity generated and provided to the grid, and hence to the charging stations in Belarus is expected to be fossil free during the implementation period as per the near-term plans of transitioning to 100% electricity generation from nuclear power in Belarus.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the M&E plan is shown in the section of 9. *Monitoring and Evaluation*.  
*Describe the budgeted M&E plan* with a time table.

Agency Response  
UNDP, 09/09/2021:

The monitoring plan with the frequency of monitoring is now inserted to the CEO AR as Annex N (This is also presented as Annex 3 of the Project document).

### **Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, these benefits are described in Section 10. *Benefits*.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**



**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, all annexes are attached to the CEO AR document.

9/15/2021 PM

No, please include the project's map and coordinates under Annex D as well.

10/12/2021 MY:

Yes, comment was addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP, 09/29/2021

The Project Map and Coordinate are now uploaded to Annex D in the GEF Portal.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, it is attached to Annex A.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

On 10/23/2019 at the PIF final stage, the GEF PM made the following comments for the agency to address at the CEO AR stage. Please address these comments.

More detailed calculation on GHG emission reductions is required.

Please breakdown the budgets for individual outputs for each of the components. For example, the budget for monitoring, evaluation and verification of the protect results needs to be specified at the CEO ER stage.

Please indicate the exact venues for installation of fast charging stations.

Please make sure the UNDP will not perform any executing functions.

9/10/2021 PM:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

UNDP, 09/09/2021:

Project team has responded to the GEF PM comments which are presented in Annex B of the CEO AR.

#### Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

#### Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

#### Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, the status of PPG utilization is shown in Annex C of the CEO AR document.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

Yes, a number of project maps are shown in Annex E.

Agency Response  
**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/18/2021 MY:

No.

Please address the comments above.

9/10/2021 PM:

The CEO Endorsement is cleared and recommended from the technical point of view by the PM.

9/15/2021 PM

No. Please address the following comments:

1. Project Information: The Project information section of the CEO Endorsement states that the project duration amounts to 48 months. If this is correct, please update the expected date to 12/31/2015 (instead of 12/31/2016).

2. Co-financing:

- Please clarify whether Belarusneft shall be categorized as "Recipient Country Government". Although it is a "state-owned" company, we checked their website (<https://www.belorusneft.by/sitebeloil/en/addUp/about/history/>) and it does look like this should be more categorized as Private Sector. Please clarify and update accordingly.

-As per the Co-financing letters it seems that the EU4climate project is funded by the European Union, in which case the category should be Donor Country. But the end of the letter it stipulates that "Overall total UNDP co-financing is 676,000 USD". This would imply that the category should be GEF Agency. Also it's not clear whether this co-financing is a grant. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

3. On the Budget:

- Please align the numbers in the table so all the numbers appear in one line.

- The salary of the Project Manager has been charged across the components and the PMC. Please also note that as per GEF Project Guidelines "If project staff are charged to both PMC and project components (i.e. not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat". On the TORs for the Project Manager provided in the Agency ProDoc, please note that the described duties and responsibilities are mainly related with Management / Coordination ? we can't appreciate the detailed contribution to the project's components. If there is no contribution from the Project Manager to the specific components, please update the

budget so the salary of the Project Coordinator is covered by the both the GEF and the co-financing portions of the PMC.

4. Please include the Project Map and coordinates under Annex D as well.

9/23/2021 PM

Please address comments from 9/15/2021 highlighted in blue above in this box.

10/12/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

The PM recommends technical clearance for this project.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	8/18/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	10/12/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The objective of the project is to remove barriers to the e-vehicle market in Belarus by removing barriers to help make e-vehicles more accessible to citizens of the country by changing legislation, regulations, and policy. The project consists of three major components: (1) Policies and regulations to promote increased purchase and improved management of e-vehicles; (2) Investment into super-fast charging stations; and (3) Promotion of e-vehicles. Expected outputs include: (1) Developed and adopted national policy on sustainable transport which include measures for the promotion of the mobility and future management of operation and maintenance of the mobility technology; (2) Feasibility studies for at least 3 Super-Fast Charging Stations; (3) Installation of at least two or more berth Super-Fast Charging Station(s) (300+kW) to compliment the charging infrastructure network of Belarus; and (4) Consensus amongst senior government officials on moving forward with a super-fast charging station program. With about \$1.3 million of GEF grant, this project will mobilize about \$13.3 million of co-financing from the government. The project is innovative and capable of scaling up because the investment of the project is to pilot super-fast charging stations in the country that will demonstrate to consumers the convenience and long-term affordability of electric vehicle usage. This should result in a catalysis of the market for e-vehicles and an immediate increase in the use of e-vehicles in Belarus. The project aims at mitigating more than 150,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> during its lifetime operation.

**COVID-19 risk analysis:** During the detailed design and development of the Project, a more comprehensive analysis on the potential risks of Covid-19 was carried out based on the knowledge learned by the project development team members about the nature and impacts of the pandemic. Based also on the analysis, the project team found the following risks due to COVID 19: (1) it may cause uncertain demand for e-vehicles and their associated charging stations; (2) it may disrupt implementation of Project activities such as procurement/import of the super-fast charging stations into Belarus which may slow down Project implementation, thereby causing Project delays and unable to meet its goals and targets in a timely manner. To mitigate these risks, the project team will work with the government to take measures that will deal with the risks once they come to impact the project.

**The COVID-19 opportunities.** The key opportunities include (1) building significant modern, low-carbon super-fast charging stations so that post-pandemic promotion of low-carbon technologies such as electromobility (while not increasing the use of harmful chemicals and ensuring the ability to recapture and recycle materials at the end of life); (2) promoting local business development projects which improves resilience to climate change and hence, enabling post-Covid green recovery.