

Promoting transition to electric mobility for low carbon development in the Kyrgyz Republic: Enhancing charging infrastructure and catalysing active private sector participation

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11829

Countries

Kyrgyz Republic

Project Name

Promoting transition to electric mobility for low carbon development in the Kyrgyz Republic: Enhancing charging infrastructure and catalysing active private sector participation

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

11/6/2024

Review completed by PM

3/31/2025

Program Manager

Wenxin Li

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: Yes.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments WL 11/8/2024: Yes.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: Yes.

OP 11/13/2024: Please include / capture gender dimensions in Outputs 2.5, 3.4, 3.5, 4.5. 1.

WL 2/4/2025: Gender dimensions are not yet explicitly included in Outputs 3.4, 3.5, 4.5, 5.1, although the description texts referred to such considerations.

WL 3/28/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

Gender responsiveness/mainstreaming dimensions have been included in the A. Project description section in outputs 2.5, 3.4, 3.5 and 4.5. We assume that the reference to ?1.? refers to output 5.1, and the description of component 5 has been revised accordingly (p.25).

February 2025

Gender dimensions are now also added explicitly in output titles, too.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 3/28/2025: Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: Please ensure that the current situation includes feedbacks from stakeholder that are considering or implementing EV investments in the country, including Bishkek Municipal Bus Company, EBRD, ADB, KOICA and WB, and that the barriers and enablers are aligned with their experiences and lessons.

WL 2/4/2025: Output 3.6 refers to existing fiscal incentives, which should be described in the current situation.

WL3/28/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

As mentioned in the "Relevant stakeholders" section, stakeholders supporting EV investments in the country were identified through bilateral interviews during the scoping mission. Further information on their experience and lessons, and the project's alignment with them, has been included in the barriers and enablers discussion in the "baseline" part (pp.10-11) of the Project Rationale section.

February 2025:

A paragraph describing existing fiscal incentives has now been added (PIF page 9).

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: Related to the comment above, clarify and ensure that the project design addresses lessons and experiences from stakeholder that are considering or implementing EV

investments in the country, including Bishkek Municipal Bus Company, EBRD, ADB, KOICA and WB.

WL 2/4/2025: Yes.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

Further information on the project's alignment with the experiences, lessons and gaps identified by key stakeholders, including Bishkek Municipal Bus Company, EBRD, ADB, KOICA and WB have been included in the barriers and enablers discussion in the 'baseline' part (p.10-11) of the Project Rationale section.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024:

Please ensure consistent descriptions of the outcomes between (1) the first few paragraphs of Section B Project Description and the TOC chart and (2) the paragraphs after the TOC. For example, outcome 1 has been described as:

- 'the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic accelerates the deployment of e-mobility in the country by enhancing coordination, capacity, planning and endorsing a medium-term strategic vision'. and

- *"An inclusive and coordinated national framework for electric mobility is established through a government-supported, gender-responsive strategy, strengthened technical capacities, and an informed stakeholder network to drive sustainable e-mobility initiatives."*

The linkage with the GEF-8 global e-mobility program may include the participation of its Global Thematic Working Groups, Global Partnership, Regional Support and Investment Platforms, where applicable in each Component.

Please consider including electric two- or three-wheelers as a vehicle type for piloting and financial mechanism, instead of government fleet vehicles, under component 2 and 3. If electric two- or three-wheelers are not included in this project, please provide the rationale.

WL 2/4/2025:

Please ensure consistent descriptions of the outputs among (a) the first few paragraphs of Section B Project Description, (b) the TOC chart and (c) the paragraphs after the TOC. For example, the output on the plan for the national EV charging network described in component 1 according to (b) and component 2 according to (a), and the regional workshop is described in component 3 according to (a) and component 4 according to (c). Assuming that the TOC chart is outdated and needs to be corrected to be consistent with the other two parts,

- for output 2.3, please consider replacing the government fleet pilot with additional private sector fleet pilots; otherwise further refine the rationale for including government fleets for subsidizing electrification, considering the limited mileage driven by government vehicles on average and the corresponding fossil fuel savings per vehicle.
- for output 2.4, please clarify why the number of vehicles to be included in each fleet is capped and no minimum is provided.
- for output 3.5, please clarify the deliverable output, rather than an activity.
- for outputs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5, please clarify the target audience.

WL 3/28/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

The paragraphs describing the outcomes at the beginning of the 'Project Description' section have been updated; they are now the same as those stated in the Indicative Project Overview table, in the TOC chart and in the descriptive paragraphs after the TOC chart.

Participation in the Global Thematic Working Groups, Global Partnership, Regional Support and Investment Platforms of the GEF-8 Global E-mobility Programme has been included together with other capacity-building activities in output 1.4 (component 1); interaction with and feedback from the Global E-mobility Programme is envisaged in the update of the National Strategy (component 3) and in the work on end-of-life EV battery management (component 4); monitoring and evaluation results and lessons learnt will also be shared (component 5), contributing to the assessment of the impacts achieved by the Global Programme.

Thank you for raising this topic. Indeed, electric two- or three-wheelers are a relevant vehicle category in urban mobility in many child projects within the Global E-mobility Programme. However, these vehicle categories do not play a relevant role in urban mobility in Bishkek and other Kyrgyz cities. Moreover, in line with the approach in many other cities around the world, local transport authorities in Bishkek consider that the promotion of 2 and 3 wheelers (electric or not) would have negative impacts in terms of traffic congestion, unfair competition with bus-based public transport (which is being strongly supported by the authorities) and additional road safety challenges.

February 2025

- Output statements in the General Project Information section (Indicative project overview table) and in the ToC diagram have been updated to be consistent with (a) the first few paragraphs of Section B Project Description and (c) the paragraphs after the TOC; the latter have been expanded to improve consistency with the output statements, including explicit reference in brackets to each output to facilitate its reading. Note that component 1 includes the National electric mobility Strategy, whereas component 2 includes a deployment plan for the national EV charging network; the regional workshop (output 3.7) includes lessons learned from both, regulatory activities (component 3) and EV waste management (component 4).

- Output 2.3. Government fleets serve as high-visibility pilots that demonstrate the viability of electric vehicles (EVs) in local conditions, encouraging broader adoption across sectors. Public sector leadership can help drive confidence in electrification, particularly in emerging markets like Kyrgyzstan. Public fleet electrification aligns with government sustainability goals and allows policymakers to set an example for the private sector. It also provides a basis for refining regulations, infrastructure planning, and incentives that can later benefit private sector adoption. Unlike private fleets, which may be more sensitive to market fluctuations, government fleets provide a stable use case for EV integration, ensuring that lessons learned can be effectively scaled. While government vehicles may have lower mileage, their predictable routes and centralized management make them ideal candidates for EV deployment, benefiting from lower operating and maintenance costs over the long term, especially if coupled with technical support, training and introduction of modern fleet management systems, as the project intends to do (outputs 2.5 and 2.6). Also, public procurement is generally considered as a strong lever for electrification. The project description has been expanded and includes additional criteria to achieve the expected results; besides reducing the project's contribution to the incremental costs (cost difference between a conventional vehicle and an electric one of similar dimensions and characteristics) as already stated in the output description, the project will focus on utilitarian vehicles used for public services (with higher mileage, therefore excluding vehicles dedicated to transport public officials, which usually have much lower mileage). The output description also provides further details on how the demonstration will inform public procurement policy for vehicles to transition toward electric fleets. A minimum threshold of 4 EVs to include in the governmental fleet is set in the output statement as this is considered as the minimum to reach

some visibility among governmental fleet managers. More elaborated criteria for this demonstration will be elaborated during the PPG stage.

- Output 2.4.: this has been revised to refer to a minimum.

- Output 3.5. The output statement has been revised. The deliverable will be recommendations on how to promote financing schemes accessible to women entrepreneurs and women-led businesses.

- Outputs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5. The audience targeted for outputs 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 was already identified as ?car dealers and importers, as well as the local e-waste management companies?. The description in component 4 (page 26) has been expanded to include the targeted audience.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments WL 11/8/2024: Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

OP 11/13/2024:

1. The executing agency listed in the PIF is different than the one in the LOE. Please ensure consistency in the portal entry and enter the anticipated executing entities as identified in the LOE.

2. GEF policies, further explained in the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, require that ?the separation of implementation functions performed by GEF Agencies and execution functions performed by Project Executing Entities is a key feature of the governance of the GEF Partnership and an important aspect of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards.?

See

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf. (pages 44-45)

At PIF stage, Agency (?dual?) execution should not be included in the Agency's proposal. Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution, the Agency would submit full information and justification for a request for policy exception.

WL 2/4/2025: please provide clarity on DPC, as this execution request cannot be assessed without the DPC details.

WL 3/28/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

1. This is now reconciled. Please refer to the updated letter.
2. The separation of implementation and execution functions will be ensured in line with GEF policy. Clear lines of responsibility, reporting, monitoring and evaluation and accountability within the UNDP between the implementation and execution functions will be followed, as needed. Detailed description of the governance structure and budget will be developed during the PPG stage. The specific amount for the direct project costs (DPC) will be calculated during the PPG phase on the basis of the project detailed budget. At this stage we can confirm that the DPC will be included in the PMC and that PMC will not exceed the recommended threshold as per the GEF Policy.

February 2025

In line with the GEF policy, that at PIF stage, Agency (dual) execution should not be included in the Agency's proposal, revisions are now made to the PIF. The Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision is now listed as the Implementing Partner. The relevant parts of the PIF have been revised accordingly, deleting any former references to direct implementation modality or execution services at the PIF stage. Detailed implementation modality will be determined and re-assessed during the PPG stage and discussed/confirmed to GEF prior to the CEO endorsement approval request. Please refer to the updated Letter of Endorsement.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: please submit Excel calculations of the GHG emissions reductions to allow review and verification. Please provide detailed explanation and justification for each assumption in the calculations.

WL 2/4/2025:

- The 40KM/year distance travel should be justified and adjusted for the project context, especially for the government fleet.
- The formula in Cell C14 should be double checked.
- Please confirm if there is any double counting between the emission reductions from EVs and those from charging stations, otherwise, adjust accordingly.
- The formula in Cell C25 should be double checked, as the emissions from electricity are not accounted for.
- Please provide justification for the replication factor, for the charging stations and for the fleet, respectively.

WL 3/28/2025: cleared, with the understanding that the approach will be refined during the PPG phase, when a lower causality factor for indirect impact such as 20% should be applied. The energy savings should also be corrected during PPG, as the energy from electricity (as in the project scenario) should be deducted from the energy consumption from fossil fuels.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

Explanatory notes for calculations provided in the tables have been incorporated to the Core Indicators section, and the Excel file has been submitted.

February 2025

- The 40 km/year distance was taken as a conservative average between the high mileage of urban minibuses (probably above 70,000 km/year) and the lower mileage of cars and vans (probably around 20,000 km/year). In the excel file, an estimate of average values has been made, assuming very conservative fuel consumption values. A sentence has been added in PIF (page 28). A more accurate estimate, differentiating vehicle categories and fleet ownership cannot be provided at this stage, but will be done during PPG, once a more detailed identification of potential demonstration fleets is available.

- Thanks for noticing this. The formula has been corrected and the corrected tons of direct CO2 emissions mitigated (slightly higher than the previous one) has been updated.

- Possible double counting was considered negligible, and even non-existent, for two main reasons: (1) vehicles in fleets usually charge at their premises or depots, and this is expected of to be the case also for the entities participating in the demonstration, and (2) fleets are mainly used in urban trips, and will rarely engage in interurban travel. An explanatory sentence has been added in the relevant table of the PIF (page 29).

- The formula in cell C25 has been revised, to account for the emissions from electricity generation.

- Please, note that a summary justification of the value of the replication factor (60) was already provided in PIF (page 29). The justification has been expanded and is complemented by a preliminary estimate provided in the Excel file. More accurate estimates of direct and indirect emission savings will be provided at PPG stage with the use of UNEP's e-mobility model.

April 2025:

This is noted.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's CommentsOP 11/13/2024: Please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

UNDP take a conservative approach in determining the overall risk rating: if at least one risk is considered as moderate, the project as whole is categorized as moderate risk. (Sentence is added to PIF.)

The screening and assessment of risks to project preparation and implementation resulted in 6 risks rated as low and 3 risks rated as moderate. Accordingly, the overall risk rating is considered as moderate.

Risk related to institutional capacity for implementation and sustainability is moderate, as the appropriate implementation arrangements will be put in place to ensure necessary capacities are available to ensure timely implementation of the project. These arrangements will be developed during PPG stage.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes, CCM 1-3.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: The list and dates are not provided.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

A stakeholder engagement box with the stakeholders consulted during PIF development and consultation dates, has been added to page 12.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments
8.3 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?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

OP 11/13/2024: Please obtain a revised LOE contain the footnote described below and signed by the current OFP.

1. The template utilized for this project by the OFP removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?.

2. The OFP name in the submitted LOE is different from the current OFP:

Kyrgyz Republic

Mr. Meder Mashiev

Political Focal Point since 2024-11-03

Minister

Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision

2 Erkindik Str

Bishkek 720040

Kyrgyz Republic

Tel: +996 312 300667

Email: international(at)mnr.gov.kg; bemamo(at)mail.ru

Mr. Mirslav Amankulov

Operational Focal Point since 2024-05-29

Deputy Minister

Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Technical Supervision

Erkindik Boulevard 2

Bishkek

Kyrgyz Republic

Tel: +996 312 300667

Email: international at mnr.gov.kg; omurova at mnr.gov.kg; bemamo at mail.ru

WL 3/28/2025: cleared.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

The new LoE as per the GEF comments is obtained, and the PIF is updated accordingly (see p. 33).

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments WL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments WL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's CommentsWL 11/8/2024: Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

WL 11/8/2024: Not yet.

WL 2/4/2025: Not yet. Additional technical comments and the DPC clarification request are included.

WL 4/7/2025: Not yet. Please ensure the figures in the new LoE match those in the table Source of Funds in Portal. Please amend.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GEFTF	UNDP	CC	801 418	76 135	20 500	1 948	900 000
Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate.							
GEFTF	UNDP	LD	1 166 847	110 850	29 500	2 805	1 310 000
Total GEF Resources			1 968 265	186 985	50 000	4 753	2 210 000

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Kyrgyz Republic	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	899,999.00
UNDP	GET	Kyrgyz Republic	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,310,001.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					2,210,000.00

Agency's Comments

April 2025:

The figures were checked with the GEF portal prior to previous resubmission of the LoE and appeared correct. Upon attempted revision of the figures in the GEF portal, as per LoE (\$900,000.00 and \$1,310,000.00), we received the following notification: *"Kyrgyz Republic - With this submission, cumulative sources of funds by CC (1,018,261.00) exceeds the original country STAR allocation for CC (1,018,260.96) by \$0.04?"*

Hence, we approached to the GEF IT colleagues in for further investigation at the technical side. As per their advice below, we are resubmitting the amounts as it is, (\$899,999.00 and \$1,310,001.00, respectively) and include the below communication with GEF IT colleagues.

From: Wanderson Batista Roldao

Sent: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 10:37 PM

To: Tugba Varol

Cc: Melissa Hernandez; Henry Salazar; Quynh Xuan Thi Phan

Subject: RE: GEF ID:11829 / PIMS 9719, Kyrgyzstan, Milestone: GEF Review sheet - PIF

Dear Tugba,

Thank you for your email.

After careful consideration, please submit the project with the amounts of \$899,999.00 and \$1,310,001.00, respectively.

Please include part of this exchange, and the validation error message in the project review sheet.

Regards,
Wanderson

From: Tugba Varol <tugba.varol@undp.org>

Sent: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 12:49 PM

To: Wanderson Batista Roldao <wbatistaroldao@worldbankgroup.org>

Cc: Melissa Hernandez <melissa.hernandez@undp.org>

Subject: GEF ID:11829 / PIMS 9719, Kyrgyzstan, Milestone: GEF Review sheet - PIF

[External]

Dear Wanderson,

Trust this finds you very well.

We received GEF PM's comment on Kyrgyzstan project (GEF ID: 11829). This project is on its final round of reviews. The comment is referring the misalignment of the table in LoE and the table of Source of Funds in the Portal.

WL 4/7/2025: Not yet. Please ensure the figures in the new LoE match those in the table Source of Funds in Portal. Please amend.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GEFTF	UNDP	CC	801 418	76 135	20 500	1 948	900 000
Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate.							
GEFTF	UNDP	LD	1 166 847	110 850	29 500	2 805	1 310 000
Total GEF Resources			1 968 265	186 985	50 000	4 753	2 210 000

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Kyrgyz Republic	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	899,999.00
UNDP	GET	Kyrgyz Republic	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,310,001.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					2,210,000.00

While we were submitting this project via Portal, Melissa and I ensured that the figures in both tables are exactly the same and fully matching, which should follow the figures in LoE. CC total shall be \$900,000 and LD total shall be \$1,310,000.





Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Source of Funds	Total
UNDP	GEFTF	Kyrgyzstan	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	900,000
UNDP	GEFTF	Kyrgyzstan	Land Degradation	CC STAR Allocation	1,310,000
Total GEF Resources					2,210,000

However, there should be some revision or glitch after the submission and the figures were changed as \$899,999 (CC total) and \$1,310,001(LD total). Thus, we received PM's comment regarding this, but we are sure that the figures were fully in line. Would it be possible to investigate what had happened?

In order to address PM's comment, now I corrected the figures in the Portal, as following, and received the notification of the 4 cents discrepancy. Would you please assist us to overcome this discrepancy which is only 4 cents? We shall avoid requesting another revised LoE.

F. SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR COUNTRY STAR ALLOCATION

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)	
UNDP	GET	Kyrgyz Republic	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	900,000.00	 
UNDP	GET	Kyrgyz Republic	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,310,000.00	 
+ Add New					Total GEF Resources(\$)	2,210,000.00

Save and Validate

Save & Exit

Save & Continue

Cancel

*Kyrgyz Republic - With this submission, cumulative sources of funds by CC(1,018,261.00) exceeds the original country STAR allocation for CC(1,018,260.96) by \$0.04

We'd be very appreciated for your assistance and collaboration,

Looking forward,
Regards,

Tugba

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/
Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please include specific budget lines, as appropriate and plans for monitoring and reporting on the GAP.

Agency's Comments

January 2025:

This is noted. The following statement has been included at the end of the project description section (page 18): "Social, environmental and gender dimensions are mainstreamed within the project, and a Gender Action Plan, backed by specific budget lines and plans for its monitoring and reporting, and tailored Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), will be prepared within project design". There is also a similar mention of the GAP in the risk table.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	11/8/2024	1/30/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/4/2025	3/11/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2025	4/9/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		