

Transition Towards Low and No-Emission Electric Mobility in the Ukraine: Strengthening Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure and Incentives

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10271

Countries

Ukraine

Project Name

Transition Towards Low and No-Emission Electric Mobility in the Ukraine:
Strengthening Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure and Incentives

Agencies

UNEP, EBRD

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

4/29/2021

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

12/15/2020 MY:

For some unknown reason, the CEO ER package cannot be opened. Please see the file name below and resubmit it. The best is to submit the document in MS-Word format.

Document Title	Category	Prefix	Classification	Last Modified Date	Published
PPG Document	Project Document	Child MSP CEO Approval document	Public	12/11/2020 4:53 AM	
10271_E-mobility Ukraine_UN EP ProjectDocumentPackage_2 020.12.09	Project Document	Child MSP CEO Approval document	Official Use Only	12/10/2020 2:59 PM	

This document cannot be opened. Please resubmit it. Thanks.

Document Title	Category	Prefix	Classification	Last Modified Date	Pu
PPG Document	Project Document	Child MSP CEO Approval document	Public	12/11/2020 4:53 AM	
10271_E-mobility Ukraine_UN EP ProjectDocumentPackage_2 020.12.09	Project Document	Child MSP CEO Approval document	Official Use Only	12/10/2020 2:59 PM	

This document cannot be opened. P

12/21/2020 MY:

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

The newly submitted CEO ER document can be opened.

5/4/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

The GEF PPO Unit provided the following comments. Please address them.

1. On Table B: Kindly note that Component 2 is missing outcomes and outputs for a line characterized as investment and where \$ 550,000.00 USD have been reserved. The same comment applies for the Monitoring and Evaluation.

2. On PMC: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 9.96%, for a co-financing of \$8,005,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$797,298 instead of \$185,000 (which is 2.3%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased

to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

3. On Execution function: Per GEF operations policy, a GEF implementing Agency should not perform any execution functions in a non-LDC country such as Ukraine. Please double check the project package with a focus on Annex K, replace all key words of 'Execution' with 'Implementation' where UNEP and/or the EBRD is planned to perform.

4. The M&E Budget is missing in the Portal

5. On the Budget: Chief Technical Advisor is charged across components. Given the low portion of co-financing to the PMC, an increase in the co-financing would be recommended to include the costs associated with the salary of the Chief Technical Adviser in the PMC.

6. On co-financing: Co-financing letter from STCU confirms in-kind contribution (not equity), please revise accordingly.

7. On knowledge management (KM): The MSP child project has a well-articulated KM section and in fact, KM activities/objectives are also mainstreamed into various project components. However, the KM section is missing a budget and timeline for the proposed KM deliverables. This is a requirement at the MSP CEO approval stage and must be included in the KM section, even if mentioned elsewhere in the document. In the document, one cannot see any KM budget.

5/6/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

11/01/2021

Reviewed and revised CEO ED is attached as a Word Document

05/05/2021

1. Table B ? Output for Investment of GEF: The budget of \$ 550,000.00 USD is allocated for achieving Output 2.2 to achieve the Outcome of Component 2. Table B has been amended in the portal to reflect his fact.

On M&E Budget: The M&E budget is shown in Table B as a separate row as per the GEF requirement. The issue of defining outcomes and outputs for M&E budget was discussed with Henry Salazar at GEF Sec during a call. It was agreed at that meeting

that M&E row doesn't need to provide outcomes and outputs. These guidance and understanding have been followed in all the projects submitted by UNEP.

2. Thank you for the suggestion. The PMC portion for co-financing is increased as suggested. The revised Co-finance allocations are reflected in in Table B and Annex I-2.
3. EBRD will provide execution support for Component 2 along with being the CO-IA for component 2. This was discussed with GEF Sec and related email communication is attached as a document on the portal. As suggested by GEF Sec this was also discussed with the GEF OFP who has issued a letter endorsing this arrangement. The GEF OFP letter too is attached as a document on the portal.
4. The M&E Budget was added in section 9 as suggested.
5. Co-financing budget for PMC was increased to the suggested amount.
6. Thank you for your comment. The information was corrected in the portal.
7. Budget and timeline for the proposed KM deliverables were added in section 8 as requested.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Not yet.

For output Output 1.2, please articulate (1) the number of key stakeholders to be trained and (2) the number of and the places of training workshops to be undertaken.

For Output 2.1, please elaborate the places and number of EV demonstration projects to be identified and the number of feasibility assessments to be conducted.

For Output 2.2, please describe clearly the number and capacity of EV charging demonstration stations. Some of the numbers are in the text of the components.

Project Management Costs (PMC) of the GEF TF (150,000) is larger than the cap. Please revise it.

3/2/2021 MY

Yes, comments were addressed and the issues were cleared.

Agency Response

For output Output 1.2, please articulate (1) the number of key stakeholders to be trained and (2) the number of and the places of training workshops to be undertaken.

11/01/2021

The number of key stakeholders to be trained is estimated to be 125 as detailed on page 6. This has now been added to Section - output 1.2

The number of trainings and related events (at least 7 events) are detailed in the description for output 1.2. This has now been added to section B - output 1.2. The locations for the trainings will be identified during the project implementation depending on the scope and participants of the workshop.

For Output 2.1, please elaborate the places and number of EV demonstration projects to be identified and the number of feasibility assessments to be conducted.

11/01/2021

The alternative scenario description for 2.1 explains that the project will include the development and application of a selection process to identify the EV charging infrastructure demonstration projects and to conduct feasibility studies to evaluate the technical and financial viability of the selected demonstration projects. It is during this process that the exact number and places of the EV demonstration charging stations will be confirmed. An estimate on the number of charging stations has however been provided in the alternative scenario and the "changes to project design section": 30 fast chargers and 320 slow chargers, a total estimate of up to 350 chargers, and has now been included in Section B for output 2.1. The reason for the broad range of the number of installed EV chargers is related to the fact that so far it is not defined whether the chargers financed through the project will be public slow or public fast chargers. The wide cost range of the hardware (USD 3,000 for public slow chargers up to USD 140,000 for public ultra-fast chargers) as well as for installation (USD 4,000 for public slow chargers up to USD 66,000 for public ultra-fast chargers) leads to the high range of the number of installed chargers. The discussion of hardware and installation costs has been further elaborated (page 16, under the Baseline scenario).

As for the number of chargers, the number of feasibility studies conducted depends on the number of independent demonstration projects funded (each developing a certain number of charging stations).

For Output 2.2, please describe clearly the number and capacity of EV charging demonstration stations. Some of the numbers are in the text of the components.

11/01/2021

As described above, the number of charging stations installed depend on the power output and hence hardware and installation costs of the chargers installed. An estimate on the number of charging stations has however been provided in the alternative scenario and the 'changes to project design section': 30 fast chargers and 320 slow chargers, a total estimate of up to 350 chargers, and has now been included in Section B for output 2.2 and will depend on the final mix of fast and slow chargers.

Project Management Costs (PMC) of the GEF TF (150,000) is larger than the cap. Please revise it.

11/01/2021

The Project Management Costs have been corrected to amount for 10% of project activities. The additional funds for project activities have been allocated to various outcomes and outputs, see budget in the annex. Table B has been updated accordingly.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 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

12/21/2020 MY:

Not yet.

Please consider adding some co-financing from UNEP.

Please consider getting a co-financing letter from the government including the State Space Agency of Ukraine to raise the co-financing to its PIF level (USD 13,915,000 Co-financing). This is to address the comments from the Japanese Council member.

The co-financing letter from KB Energy LLC shows total co-financing of \$120,000 with in-kind and equity investment mobilized, which is not consistent with the

information in Table C. Please get a new letter from KB Energy LLC to show only "equity investment mobilized".

3/2/2021 MY

Not completed at this time. Per the new submission dated February 26, 2021, the ratios of co-financing and investment mobilized are 5.1 and 4.8 respectively. To make the project consistent with the requirements of the GEF co-financing policy, please increase these ratios to 7 and 5. This will also help better address the comments from the Japanese Council member on co-financing.

4/29/2021 MY:

Challenged by COVID-19, the project developer has faced difficulty to raise co-financing as much as planned in the PIF. Having carefully reviewed the issues of co-financing for this project, the CCM team and the GPU manager communicated and reached a consensus: Let the project go with the current ratio of co-financing. A file of emails showing the communications is uploaded to the document folder of the project.

Agency Response

11/01/2021

The Global Child Project aims to support all Country Child Projects through the Global Thematic Working Groups, the Regional Support and Investment Platforms and the work on dissemination and communication of project results. In order to avoid double counting of co-financing from UNEP (for both the global project and the country projects), all UNEP co-finance is allocated to the activities to support the Country Child Projects under Components 1, 2 and 3 of the Global Child Project.

Additional co-financing (\$175,000) has been provided by the project Executing Agency ? STCU - , in the form of in-kind contribution.

Please consider getting a co-financing letter from the government including the State Space Agency of Ukraine to raise the co-financing to its PIF level (USD 13,915,000 Co-financing). This is to address the comments from the Japanese Council member.

11/01/2021

A co-financing letter from the State Space Agency had already been included in the submitted documents under Annex O (page 133), amounting to USD 820 million for investment in the production of 5,000 electric buses and 7,800 charging stations primarily destined for sale in the domestic market. The box titled ?Parallel financing

through the State Space Agency of Ukraine? in the ?proposed alternative scenario-component 3? section on page 34 of the project documents further describes the nature of this investment. Further explanations on the eventual inclusion of a portion of the above-mentioned investment as co-finance to the project has been added in the box.

The co-financing letter from KB Energy LLC shows total co-financing of \$120,000 with in-kind and equity investment mobilized, which is not consistent with the information in Table C. Please get a new letter from KB Energy LLC to show only "equity investment mobilized".

11/01/2021

The co-finance letter provided by KB Energy amounts to USD 120,000 in the form of in-kind and equity investment. It further details that the company?s contribution will be provided in several forms such as the design and development of charging infrastructure solutions, development of charger prototypes ready for remoted monitoring and development of monitoring software. While these contributions can be interpreted as in-kind, the letter further specifies that ? Financial contributions for the project development at the level of USD 30,000 will be provided (investment mobilized). Table C has been modified 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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is on page 80.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is on page 5.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes, it is stated on pages 9-14.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is shown on pages 14-24.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please put quantitative numbers for the planned activities in all outputs of all components shown on pages 26-37 wherever applicable. For example, the number of trainees should be put in output 1.2 on page 37. For another example, please indicate the places to install the 35,033 charging stations on page 31. Please also put this number (35,033) in Table B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY.

3/2/2021 MY

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

11/01/2021

Quantitative numbers for all outputs consistent with the results framework have been introduced in Table B as well as the output and outcome statements throughout the document where appropriate. The project aims at the installation of up to 350 chargers (not 35,033 - described in the project document under component 2). The locations of charging stations funded by the project are not yet defined as detailed in the agency response to question 2, Project description summary. The estimated number of charging stations (up to 350) has now been added to Table B.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is on page 37.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on pages 38-39.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on pages 39-40.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

In the section of sustainability, please elaborate how the infrastructure facility to be financed by this project (for example, the charging stations for example) will continue in operation after the project implementation period is over.

3/2/2021 MY

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

11/01/2021

Private sector companies are the main target of the blended financing provided under component 2. Under this component, GEF grant resources will be blended into an EBRD loan, which will be issued based on competitive application processes, to enhance the viability for investors. The Loans will be disbursed to entities that are able to demonstrate viability of their business model for the charging infrastructure funded. This will ensure that a) the loan issued will be repaid and b) the developed charging infrastructure will be operational beyond the project implementation period. The private sector investors that benefit from the financing will be the charging infrastructure owners and therefore have equity in the investment. Additional detail has been added under section 7, Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

11/01/2021
Private sector companies are the main target of the blended financing provided under component 2. Under this component, GEF grant resources will be blended into an EBRD loan, which will be issued based on competitive application processes, to enhance the viability for investors. The Loans will be disbursed to entities that are able to demonstrate viability of their business model for the charging infrastructure funded. This will ensure that a) the loan issued will be repaid and b) the developed charging infrastructure will be operational beyond the project implementation period. The private sector investors that benefit from the financing will be the charging infrastructure owners and therefore have equity in the investment. Additional detail has been added under section 7, Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Not completed yet. Please clearly mark the project boundary on page 44 and claim that the project will not cause any dispute on land use between Ukraine and its neighboring countries.

3/2/2021 MY

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response
11/01/2021

Replaced map with one which clearly shows boundaries and includes notes no expected land disputes.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. it is stated on pages 45-47.

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on pages 47-53.

Agency Response

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on 54-59.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on pages 59-60.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. They are stated on pages 60-66.

Agency Response

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on pages 66-69.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is shown on page 70.

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

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is stated on pages 71-72.

Agency Response

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
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is on pages 72-73.

Agency Response
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
12/21/2020 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please use quantitative information to show the co-benefits of the project. For example, please estimate local pollution reductions including NO_x, SO_x, and PM_{2.5} in metric tons.

3/2/2021 MY

Not completed at this time.

Please add quantitative information in the following statement: "In conjunction with the substantial CO₂ emission reductions, a significant reduction of the emissions of air pollutants such as NO_x, SO_x, PM and CO will be achieved, as electric vehicles will not generate any such pollutant emissions."

The information can be developed from the data that are used to calculate GHG emission reduction from the project.

4/29/2021 MY:

Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

Agency Response

11/01/2021

The project "Transition towards low and No-Emission Electric Mobility in the Ukraine: Strengthening electric vehicle charging infrastructure and incentives" relates to the GEF Focal Area on Climate Change Mitigation (Programming Directions CCM 1-2: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for electric drive technology and electric mobility). Reported core indicators include GHG emission reductions (metric tons of CO₂) and direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender. Estimates for core indicators have been provided at the concept and the CEO Endorsement stage and will be tracked and reported throughout the project. Air pollutants such as NO_x, SO_x, and PM_{2.5} have not normally been requested at this stage for e-mobility projects.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. All required annexes are attached, with Annex B.1 ? Responses to GEF Sec reviews (on the PFD); Annex B.2 ? Responses to GEF Sec reviews (on the PFD addendum); Annex B.3 ? Responses to STAP comments; and Annex B.4 ? Responses to Council comments in individual documents at the Document Folder of the GEF Portal.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is shown in Annex A.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is in Annex B.1.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. The Responses to Council comments are shown in Annex B.4.

To fully address the comments from the Japanese Council member, please consider enlarging co-financing from the government and UNEP. Please see more comments in the Box of co-financing above.

Agency Response

11/01/2021

Responded above with regards to UNEP co-financing and State Space Agency co-financing arrangement.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is attached at Annex B.3.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/21/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/21/2020 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes, it is in Annex C on page 80.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/21/2020 MY:

Yes. It is on page 82.

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
12/21/2020 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

12/21/2020 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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/2020 MY:

Not at this time.

Please address the comments above.

Please put Kelly West's signature and contact on page 76.

3/2/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please address the comments dated 3/2/2021.

4/29/2021 MY:

Challenged by COVID-19, the project developer has faced difficulty to raise co-financing as much as planned in the PIF. Having carefully reviewed the issues of co-financing for this project, the CCM team and the GPU manager communicated and reached a consensus: Let the project go with the current ratio of co-financing. A file of emails showing the communications is uploaded to the document folder of the project.

5/4/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

The GEF PPO Unit provided the following comments. Please address them.

1. On Table B: Kindly note that Component 2 is missing outcomes and outputs for a line characterized as investment and where \$ 550,000.00 USD have been reserved. The same comment applies for the Monitoring and Evaluation.
2. On PMC: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 9.96%, for a co-financing of \$8,005,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$797,298 instead of \$185,000 (which is 2.3%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.
3. On Execution function: Per GEF operations policy, a GEF implementing Agency should not perform any execution functions in a non-LDC county such as Ukraine. Please double check the project package with a focus on Annex K, replace all key words of ?Execution? with ?Implementation? where UNEP and/or the EBRD is planned to perform.
4. The M&E Budget is missing in the Portal
5. On the Budget: Chief Technical Advisor is charged across components. Given the low portion of co-financing to the PMC, an increase in the co-financing would be recommended to include the costs associated with the salary of the Chief Technical Adviser in the PMC.

6. On co-financing: Co-financing letter from STCU confirms in-kind contribution (not equity), please revise accordingly.

7. On knowledge management (KM): The MSP child project has a well-articulated KM section and in fact, KM activities/objectives are also mainstreamed into various project components. However, the KM section is missing a budget and timeline for the proposed KM deliverables. This is a requirement at the MSP CEO approval stage and must be included in the KM section, even if mentioned elsewhere in the document. In the document, one cannot see any KM budget.

5/6/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and issues were cleared.

The PM recommends technical clearance for this project.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/21/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of this project is to support and enable the government of Ukraine to make the transformative shift to decarbonize transport systems by promoting electric mobility at national scale. The project has three components: (1) Institutionalization of

low carbon electric mobility; (2) Short term barrier removal through low carbon electric mobility demonstrations; (3) Preparation of scale-up and replication of low-carbon electric mobility; and (4) Long-term environmental sustainability of low-carbon electric mobility. The project is innovative in several aspects. First, the project will focus on scaling-up the market for a novel e-mobility technology which has the potential to greatly increase energy efficiency. Second, it will foster the country to re-use, recycle e-wastes in the transport sector by introducing circularity. Third, the project will promote innovative business models based on the integration of web based digital technologies that are related to payment schemes, dispatching of power and the integration of renewable power generation. Fourth, it will create opportunities for green job creation both in the EV charging and in the EV manufacturing sector. With \$1,601,376 GEF funding, this project will leverage \$8,190,000 co-financing. The targeted global environment benefits include mitigating 2.55 million tonnes of CO₂ in the lifetime of the project.

Impacts and risks of Climate Change on the project:

Over the past 20 years, Ukraine has indeed increasingly exposed to climate-induced natural hazards. Strong floods have affected nearly one-third of the population of Ukraine and droughts also occur every three years. These climate hazards can lead to major devastations and cause damages to settlements, roads, nearby structures, and infrastructures in their respective areas which are related to the GEF project. The project is promoting a sustainable transport infrastructure based on e-mobility, public transport, and non-motorized transport. During project preparation, a range of measures have been taken to reduce and prevent the risks of hazardous natural phenomena aimed at identifying, assessing, mapping, and preventing hazardous events, as well as developing resilience to them. For example, while selecting the location of charging infrastructure, possibilities of very high temperature, very strong wind, and very heavy flooding have been well considered and measures have been incorporated in new construction works. Thus, the climate risks will not have any significant impacts on the project's objectives and outputs.

Challenges and risks of COVID 19:

As of April 2021, Ukraine is imposing measures to control the COVID 19 pandemic including travel restrictions, meeting restrictions, shift of government priorities, and restricted access to offices, which makes it almost impossible to organize for physical meetings and travel. This situation may continue for quite a long time. Part of the project implementation requiring face-to-face meetings and in-country missions could therefore be delayed or cancelled. Some of the envisaged travel budgets might therefore not be implemented. But the country and the Agency will make good use of information technology to foster communication and proceed the project as planned.

Opportunities of COVID 19:

There seems to be a correlation between air quality and COVID-19; where there are higher COVID-19 incidence and mortality, there are higher levels of local air pollution. This pollution includes particulate matters (e.g. PM2.5, PM10), N2O from both mobile (e.g. trucks and cars), and stationary emission sources. Since electric mobility has the potential to significantly contribute to better urban air quality, the GEF project will play an important role in Ukraine's strategy to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and future pandemics. Furthermore, a shift to electric mobility will significantly reduce the dependency of Ukraine to import petroleum fuels. It therefore will increase resilience against restrictions or price spikes resulting from international oil crisis. Finally, in terms of green recovery, clean mobility is expected to play a key role in getting the country's economy back on green track.