

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

**Review PIF 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**

10/15/2019

**Review completed by PM**

3/20/2020

**Program Manager**

Ming Yang

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, the project is aligned with GEF7 CCM-1-2: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for electric drive technologies and electric mobility.

### **Agency Response**

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, however, in the CEO ER, 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.

### **Agency Response**

**Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, the indicative co-financing information is provided on page 3 and the proposed amount of co-financing meets investment requirement of the project.

3/18/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please delete the last two rows in Table C. Please see what highlighted in circle.

### C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Government	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Ministry of Energy	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Ministry of Transport	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Ministry of Industry	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Department of Energy Efficiency	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
GEF Agency	UNDP (EU4Climate)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,600,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	82,005
Others	Belarus-Neft	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	120,000
Others	Belarus-Neft	Equity	Investment mobilized	11,304,000
Private Sector	Unison	Equity	Investment mobilized	
Private Sector	Car dealers	Equity	Investment mobilized	
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>				<b>13,606,005</b>

3/20/2020 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.

### **Agency Response**

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, the fee is aligned with the GEF policy and guideline. They are within the remainder of the STAR resources of the country.

### **Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, the STAR resources of the country are enough to cover the project.

### **Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

The CCM resource is not enough to cover the project, but the country uses marginal adjustment from LD and BD to cover the total budget of the project. Belarus has a total of marginal adjustment amount of \$2 million.

12/13/2019 MY:

In the GEF Portal, please revise " Multi Focal Area" into "Climate Change".

If the GEF Portal does not allow the change, please try to keep only one row: Climate Change Focal Area, and try it.

2/10/2020 MY:

Please keep only one row: "Climate Change Focal Area" while submitting the project in the Portal.

Please be aware that if the project is submitted as "Multi Focal Area" project, the UNDP needs to justify global environment benefits from other focal areas such as BD and LD benefits. This e-mobility project has little to do with BD and LD benefits.

The use of BD and LD funds for CCM is due to GEF STAF marginal adjustment policy. The LOE is fine. In Table D and E, the agency can just put a sum of GEF STAR fund, and put a note to explain the GEF STAF marginal adjustment policy.

2/27/2020 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed. After email communications between the UNDP and the GEF SEC, the UNDP submitted the project as a standalone CCM project, although the project budget comes from BL, LD, and CC. It complies with the GEF STAR marginal adjustment policy.

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

N/A

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

N/A

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

N/A

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:



N/A

**Agency Response**

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes

**Agency Response**

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not completed at this time.

The estimated total amount of emission reductions is low (28,000 Tonnes Direct and 115,000 Tonnes Indirect emissions). More work needs to be done in the CEO RE stage. This includes more detailed calculation of direct emission reductions and indirect emission reductions. In Table F, both direct and indirect emission reductions should be accounted. Please revise it.

11/23/2019 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.

## **Agency Response**

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is shown on page 5 (the Agency did not copy Annex C but use it to develop Table G1).

## **Agency Response**

### **Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not completed at this time. Please describe how this project is related to the global e-mobility and the global environment issues, and how this project will address the root causes that prevent Belarus from developing and investing in e-mobility.

11/26/2019 MY:

Not completed at this time. Page 16, paragraph 28 of the revised PIF is on project risk. Please describe how this project is related to the global e-mobility and the global environment issues, and how this project will address the root causes that prevent Belarus from developing and investing in e-mobility

12/13/2019 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.

### **Agency Response**

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is stated on pages 7-8. But more work is needed. The Agency mixed the Baseline Scenario with Alternative Scenario. Please see more comments below.

11/26/2019 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.

### **Agency Response**

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not completed. Please split the baseline scenario from the baseline scenario on pages 7-8, before presenting the project components.

11/26/2019 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.

### **Agency Response**

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, the project is aligned with GEF7CCM-1-2: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for electric drive technologies and electric mobility.

### **Agency Response**

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please write a section on "incremental / additional cost reasoning" as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12.

11/26/2019 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and the PIF was revised on para 19 (not 18).

### **Agency Response**

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, but more detailed work needs to be done. See the comments above on GHG emission reduction calculations. Energy savings in MJ also need to be presented.

### **Agency Response**

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not completed at this time.

On page 10, please justify why the project is new or innovative. Please elaborate how the M&O costs of the demo projects will be covered when the GEF project implementation period is over.

11/26/2019 MY:

Not completed. Please elaborate how the M&O costs of the demo projects will be covered when the GEF project implementation period is over.

12/13/2019 MY:

Not at this time. **page 10, para 22** does not contain such information.

In the future, please highlight the revision in the PIF for easier reading.

2/10/2020

Yes, comments were addressed.

MY:

### **Agency Response**

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not completed. On page 10, please mark the positions of the super fast charging stations to be installed via this project.

11/26/2019 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed. In the CEO RE stage, please clearly indicate the venues of the super charging stations.

### **Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, It is staged on pages 10-12.

### **Agency Response**

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is stated on page 13.

### **Agency Response**

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is briefly stated on page 13. More work to engage the private sector is needed in the PPG.

### **Agency Response**

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is stated on pages 14-15. But more detailed descriptions and measures on risk mitigation should be elaborated in the GEO ER.

**Agency Response**

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is briefly stated on page 15. But more detailed descriptions should be elaborated in the GEO ER.

**Agency Response**

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:



Yes, it is stated on pages 15-16.

## **Agency Response**

### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, it is stated on page 16.

## **Agency Response**

### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Yes, the endorsement letter is signed by Ms. Iya Malkina and the letter is available in the GEF Portal.

Ms. Iya Malkina

Operational Focal Point since 2014-09-16

Political Focal Point since 2014-09-16

The GEF web shows the above information on 10/23/2019.

### **Agency Response**

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

N/A

### **Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

Not at this time. Please address the above comments.

In addition, please pay attention to the following announcement of the GEF:

As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

11/26/2019 MY:

Not at this time. Please address the above comments.

In GHG emission calculation, there is a mistake in the following paragraph "Carbon Emissions Estimations as per the GEF guidance on Carbon Emissions for electrical consumption points to estimations of carbon intensity of the electrical production of the next power plant to come on line; in Belarus this will be a very large Nuclear Power plant, producing around 15 billion MW of Electricity, enough to cover foreseeable demand from e-vehicles". Please double check "...producing around 15 billion MW of Electricity"

The following argument on UNDP's executing function such as procurement, recruitment and operational transactions in addition to management oversight is not acceptable. "The Republic of Belarus is a lower middle income country. However support to national implementing partners is needed for various activities including procurement, recruitment and operational transactions in addition to management oversight. The main reason for this is the fact that the specific implementing partner from the Government does not have capacity to implement itself the project (high inefficiency and unclear practices)."

Please use the government to oversees the execution of the project, and engage an NGO to undertake the execution functions. A good NGO can be found and engaged through the following link: <https://www.ngo.by/en/ngo>

Thanks for cooperation with the GEF policy.

12/13/2019 MY:

Not at this time.

Please address the comments which were not addressed yet. Please note the following GEF Policy:

*Based on GEF policies and guidelines on Project Cycle Management regarding the dual roles of Implementing and Executing Agency, the case and associated documentation presented here do not constitute an exceptional case as defined in those document. We therefore are not in a position to clear this issue in our final review.*

*2/10/2020 MY:*

*Not at this time. Please address the comments on the issue of multi-focal area project vs CCM project.*

*Please also confirm the removal all the languages of UNDP's dual roles of Implementing and Executing Agency for the project. Thank you.*

*2/27/2020 MY:*

Yes, comments were addressed and the UNDP submitted the project in a CCM project. Also, the UNDP stressed that the project will be run under the NIM or National Implementation Modality with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment as the Executing Agency and the Belarusneft as the Main (Key) partner.

*3/4/2020 MY:*

In the Co-financing table list, two co-financiers (Unison and Car dealers) have not been materialized. Please either put detailed information there or remove both the co-financiers. They can be added at the CEO Approval stage, if they are willing to join the project.

Additionally, UNDP grant (\$82k) is classified as investment mobilized but it's actually the same amount as the co-financing PMC, in which case it should not be classified as investment mobilized. Please amend it accordingly.

*3/16/2020 MY:*

The first comment in "3/4/2020 MY:" has not been addressed.

"In the Co-financing table list, two co-financiers (Unison and Car dealers) have not been materialized. Please either put detailed information there or remove both the co-financiers. They can be added at the CEO Approval stage, if they are willing to join the project. "

Please take an action and make sure the work is well done.

3/18/2020 MY:

Not completed yet.

Please delete the two rows in Table C as shown below:

### C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Government	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Ministry of Energy	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Ministry of Transport	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Ministry of Industry	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Government	Department of Energy Efficiency	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
GEF Agency	UNDP (EU4Climate)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,600,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	82,005
Others	Belarus-Neft	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	120,000
Others	Belarus-Neft	Equity	Investment mobilized	11,304,000
Private Sector	Unison	Equity	Investment mobilized	
Private Sector	Car dealers	Equity	Investment mobilized	
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>				<b>13,606,005</b>

Please make sure the work is well done before submission. Thanks.

3/20/2020 MY:

Yes, all the comments were addressed and the PIF was revised accordingly. The PM recommends PIF to be checked by PPO for clearance.

4/6/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time. The PPO Unit provided the following comment. Please address it.

*On Environmental and Social Safeguards : Section 5 of the PIF show that some risks screening has taken place, but they should be able to, at this stage, provide the completed UNDP Social and Environmental Screening (SESP) Checklist. Has this screening taken place ? If so, can the Agency provide the report? If the report is not available at this stage, please provide a justification or some additional information on the preliminary overall risk classification of the project, the types of risks identified and any preliminary measures to address these identified risks/ potential impacts.*

4/7/2020 MY:

Yes, Comments were addressed and additional information has been provided. The PM recommends PIF clearance.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/23/2019 MY:

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.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The UNDP/GEF project (GEF ID 10152), “Reducing barriers to promote electric mobility in the Republic of Belarus through the introduction of ultra-fast charging stations” will promote e-vehicles in the country. The project has three components. The objective of the first component is to help the government to develop new national and municipal regulations and policy that will catalyse further investments in e-vehicles and the relevant infrastructure. The second component is to demonstrate feasibility and cost-effeteness of e-vehicle development in Belarus with at least six fast charging stations. The third is to build capacity and raise awareness for scaling up e-vehicles in the country. The GEF gran of \$1.3 million will mobilize more than \$13 million co-financing from the government and other stakeholders including \$11,304,000 equity investment from a state-owned company. The project will mitigate 143,000 tonnes of CO2 in its lifetime.



