



# Global Programme to Support Countries to Upscale Integrated Electric Mobility Systems

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11074

**Countries**

Global (Azerbaijan, Fiji, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe)

**Project Name**

Global Programme to Support Countries to Upscale Integrated Electric Mobility Systems

**Agencies**

UNEP, EBRD, World Bank, ADB

**Date received by PM**

4/6/2023

**Review completed by PM**

5/15/2023

**Program Manager**

Filippo Berardi

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

PFD

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

**\*\*\* Please mark all changed in the portal with yellow highlighter in the first review, blue in the second review, and so on with different colors until end of the review process, for ease of reference. \*\*\***

**CLEARED.**

**05/15/23, FB**

**05/12/23, FB**

1. Please remove all decimals and try \$1,594,211, if this doesn't work, then try \$1,594,210. Please contact GEFSEC PM if there are further problems.

2. Cleared.

**04/21/23, FB**

1. Please remove all decimal places and round all financial numbers across all financing tables in the Portal entry, for both child projects and the PFD. Zimbabwe child project is the one with decimal places.

2. Program commitment deadline is missing, please add it.

Agency's Comments

**05/12/2023, UNEP**

**1. Thank you for the guidance. There was an error message when trying to round up. We have then rounded down to \$1,594,210 Zimbabwe's amount (there is then a 1USD difference at the PPG Agency fee).**

**05/04/2023, UNEP**

1. Decimal has been removed from the PFD word document, but when indicating the funds related to Zimbabwe, we have an error message of exceeding the STAR allocation by a few

cents. As per GEF guidance for other programmes, we are keeping the decimals not to block the submission.

2. The deadline has been included now.

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

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Biodiversity is selected as BD1, while there is no mention in the document of any benefits for biodiversity. We recommend selecting BD0 (no contribution). For more details on Rio Markers selection, please consult the relative GEF guidance.

Adaptation is selected as CCA1: there is no activity related to adaptation, so unless this is justified in the project description, the correct selection should be CCA0.

Agency's Comments

05/04/2023, UNEP

Rio Marker for Biodiversity and Climate Change Adaptation have been revised to 0. We note, though, that the project does target resilience but it is not purely climate change resilience but a broader approach of resilience.

**2. Program Summary**

**a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**05/12/23, FB**

**04/21/23, FB**

1. Please include a statement in the project summary about the problem that needs to be addressed.

2. It would be best to qualify the program as the GEF-UNEP Global Electric Mobility Program at the beginning of the Summary, mentioning that it includes XX countries funded by GEF7 and additional countries funded by the EU and other partners.

3. *?It will increase? to ?(STAR) of up to USD 90 million?:* this text is too forward looking; better to stick to the actual approval included in this round, from 32 to 41 countries. Please state the number of countries that are being added through this program (as approved in June 2023) and the corresponding amount. The PFD can mention that there is strong interest from other countries and that an approximate X additional countries are likely to join /have expressed interest in joining the program over the course of GEF8.

4. Please conclude the summary with a statement on the expected GEBs (emission reductions + chemicals), ballpark is ok. You can also mention that this will build on the emission reductions expected from the GEF7 countries (of XX mil tons).

#### Agency's Comments

05/04/2023, UNEP

1. The problem is now mentioned in the project summary.
2. Revision in the reference to the program has been applied as suggested.
3. The text making reference to the number of countries has been revised to indicate only the current number of countries and as an estimation the number of potential additional countries.
4. The expected GEBs have been included at the end of the summary.

#### 3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

#### Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**  
05/12/23, FB

04/21/23, FB

- A) the program objective statement is fine.  
B) components and outcomes and appropriate and track well the theory of change.  
C) Yes.  
D&E) On PMC: it is slightly above 5% (5.6%) since some of the child projects are MSPs. However, the PMC portion drawn from the co-financing (3.6%) is lower and thus not proportional to the one drawn from the GEF component, please amend this.

#### Agency's Comments

05/04/2023, UNEP

D&E) The PMC percentage has been revised in the PFD. It has been increased and is now slightly above 5%.

#### 4 Program Outline

##### A. Program Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?

**b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**

**c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?**

**d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?**

**e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**05/12/23, FB**

**04/21/23, FB**

A) Current situation:

It is well described, please address the following minor comments:

1. ?In 2021, 10% of all new sold cars were electric (Figure 1)?: Figure 1 does not have aggregated data for the world. It shows market shares above 10% in China and Europe, best clarify/correct this.
2. please include a link to the UC Davis study which is quoted.

B) Stakeholders:

1. it would be relevant to have a better description of the stakeholders involved and their role, especially from the private sector (both as stakeholder/partner and as financier).
2. The new working group on financing/financial instruments & models is very welcome and timely. However, the description/plans to engage further the private sector are weak. The PFD states that commercial banks have been consulted and engaged, but fails to explain further these consultations and engagement. Addition information would be welcomed on their potential role under the project, particularly on developing new business models and providing innovative financial instruments.
3. This project has a top-down approach, but it is surprising that ?users? are never mentioned. Drivers, users of public transportation/micromobility/active mobility, workers, etc. Gender. Please expand this section to offer details on the implications for users/beneficiaries of the technology, including from a gender perspective.

C) Baseline:

1. Table 1: please include a date for project status list (as of?)
2. Figure 2: please can you label the figure as ?Overview of UNEP?s GEF7 Global Electric Mobility Program? Most of the financing is from the GEF and the main structure of the Program (working groups, S&I platforms, etc) was entirely funded with GEF7 resources.

D) Even though the GEF7 Program is just recently starting full implementation, are there any major/key lessons and/or adjustments that have been taken into consideration in the design which could be briefly listed?

E) N/A

## Agency's Comments

05/04/2023, UNEP

- A)
  1. Figure 1 description has been amended.
  2. Link to UC Davis report has been added.
- B)
  1. Stakeholders role descriptions have been expanded.
  2. Private sector engagement on finance has been further described. Commercial banks have not been consulted yet but will be during project development phase. Their potential role has been included.
  3. Users/Beneficiaries have been added to the stakeholder table and mentioned when relevant.
- C)
  1. Additional column with date has been added.
  2. Figure has been relabeled.
- D)
  1. Examples of lessons learnt have been included at the end of section A.

## 5 B. Program Description

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**

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

**c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?**

**e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?**

**f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?**

**g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?**

**h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?**

**i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**05/15/23, FB**

---

**05/12/23, FB**

General Comments: **Cleared.**

A) Theory of Change: **Cleared.**

B) Alternative scenario: **Cleared**

C) Components:

1. C.2) **Cleared.** thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

2. C.3.1) **Cleared.** While this is cleared for PFD stage, the following request has been included as a point to be further developed during PPG: *The share between TA and INV for the GEF component is approximately 24% or 34% depending on is the resources for the Global Child Project, which are 100% TA, are accounted for. The GEFSEC considers that while there is a strong additionality for the use of GEF resources as TA funds, there is also a strong case to use GEF resources as direct investments to re-risk and incentivize pilot activities. The Lead Agency is encouraged to work with Country Child Projects to increase the share of GEF resources used as INV, where possible, during PPG stage.*

3. C.3.2): **Cleared**

4. C.5): **Cleared**

D) Incremental cost reasoning: **Cleared.**

E) Gender: **Cleared.** The Agency is reminded that gender activities will have to be reflected in relevant components in all child projects.

F) Stakeholders:

**2.1 - Not Addressed:** the requested "short description of the approach and efforts to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the Coordination Child Project before CEO Endorsement" was not find in the resubmitted version. Please include it in the relevant section after Table 4 "overview of stakeholder consultations".

**2.2. Cleared.**

**2.3. Cleared.** Additional discussions with IEA as partner are strongly encouraged, and GEFSEC would like to be informed about progress on this during PPG.

H) Knowledge: **Cleared.**

I) Policy Coherence: **Cleared.**

---

**04/21/23, FB**

#### GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. Please align the Program Objective statement in this section with the one in the Indicative Program Overview section.

2. under the list of programme objectives, the first one should make it clear that this PFD is only adding 9 additional countries, but that it is expected that additional countries will join over the course of GEF8. Suggest Reframing the first objective to "Expand the coverage of the existing Program to onboard additional countries? ? 9 now and several later, responding to country demand.

3. Similar to the previous point, please revise the statement under the Integrated electric mobility systems Child Country Projects: "Approximately 20 Country Child Projects will use part of their STAR??. As discussed above, this is an expectation, not a fact. Please only refers to what is included in the PFD (with letters of endorsement) as factual, and

then mention that there is future expectation/likelihood to receive additional country request to onboard more countries.

4. Since there are key changes in the design structure between GEF7 and GEF8 programs, it is important to clearly identify what is new, what being continued from the GEF7 Program and what is being discontinued. Please present a clear diagram of this, including all working groups and platforms.

5. In particular, it is noted that there is no longer focus on grid infrastructure, charging and integration with renewable. Is this the case? If so, please provide justification.

6. 3 of the Working Groups established under GEF7 will be discontinued, and one will be continued with a modified/enlarged scope. 2 new WGs will be introduced, this means there will be 3 WGs in the GEF8 program. It is unclear from the description which of these 3 WGs will cover the EV trade and EV/batteries EOL topics. Please clarify this accordingly in the document.

7. Related to the previous point, it would be good to include a diagram mapping the differences between the GEF7 and the GEF8 program, including the WGs that are being discontinued, the new ones and the ones that are being continued. Alternatively, figure 3 could be amended so that in the "global" box the GEF8 working groups could be listed (as in Figure 2 the GEF7 working groups are listed).

8. We are missing a specific reference to electric utilities which play a vital role in ensuring renewable power integration and digitalization. Still, the utilities capacity is very low, particularly as they are tied up to annual municipality's budgets which give them little room for innovation and improvements of the distribution network. This is one of the weakest points in the EM value chain and one which needs further attention. Please clarify how/where this aspect will be given consideration.

#### A) THEORY OF CHANGE:

1. Thank you for providing a diagram each for the Problem Tree and the TOC, this is helpful. However, the display resolution of TOC diagram is too poor, and the diagram is not legible in the portal or PDF versions. Please substitute for a version with better resolution.

2. In addition to the diagrams, please include a brief narrative describing the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, how the proposed approach provides a robust solution, including the key assumptions that are made.

B) GEF ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO: Yes, there is a good description on how the program builds on previous GEF investments.

C) COMPONENTS: are well described, but please address the following comments:

C.2: Component 1 and 2 could be better demarcated, as conceptually both seems to be designed to support capacity building for policy preparation, with component 1 focusing more on the 'feasibility and planning stage' and component 2 on the actual policy development. Regardless, all the activities listed in Component 1 could also be classified as 'readiness for upscaling of integrated e-mobility systems'. Could you please include (perhaps at the outset of the component 2 section) a short and clear clarification of how component 2 is different and builds on component 1? There may be also an element related to the current stage of development (and needs) of e-mobility in each participating country that motivates the different intensity of the offering included in component 1 and 2 respectively (i.e. Country X may only need component 2 activities since it is already somewhat advanced, while Country Z will only start with component

C.3.1: The allocation of GEF resources for investments/pilots at country level seems much lower than in the GEF7 program. 5 million out of a total of 28M. Please explain how with such small % it will be possible to reach the objectives under Component 3. This is a rather important issue that will be also picked up with each individual child project being submitted for endorsement.



C.3.2. It is useful also to clarify at the beginning of the components section this 'offering menu' approach from which the countries will be able to choose, and that not all countries will make use of all activities/outputs listed in both component 1 and 2, but only the relevant ones.

C.5: the relationship between the components of the PFD (Program) and the components of (i) the Global Child Project and (ii) National Child projects is not explained. First, how is the child-project-level financing by component feeding into the PFD financing tables, considering that different child projects have different component structures from the global child project? Second, is the program ensuring that country child project indicators match the one at program level? Will child projects be asked to choose from one or more 'mandatory' program indicators? An explanation of the mechanics around this would be important.

D) INCREMENTAL COST REASONING:

Please add a paragraph summarizing how the program respond to the relative guidance from GEF council (GEF/C.31/12), as required by the PFD template.

G & F) GENDER AND STAKEHOLDERS:

1. **Gender Cleared.** Gender perspective was included through the description of the complementary German Federal Government UNEP-implemented project and how that will inform the gender components /activities in child projects. The Agency is reminded that gender activities will have to be reflected in relevant components in all child projects.

2. Relevant Stakeholders have been identified and consulted. However:

2.1: (From PPO) Please include a short description of the approach and efforts to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the Coordination Child Project before CEO Endorsement.

2.2 Please add a short description of the role of each co-implementing agency.

2.3: IEA was an important partner in the GEF7 program but it is not listed as partner for the global program/child project of the GEF8 program. Please clarify what role IEA will have in the GEF8 program and what engagement discussions have taken place to this end with the IEA team.

H) KNOWLEDGE: Cleared.

knowledge generation and management is build into the program structure and forms a key part of several components, including component 1 and 4. Component 4 in particular will respond to the main KM requirement of GEF policy.

I) Policy Coherence: Please add a paragraph to outline how the program will contribute to policy coherence, including in terms of disincentivizing fossil fuel based transportation.

## Agency's Comments

05/12/2023, UNEP

C) Components

2. C3.1 we note the comment that during PPG stage UNEP should work with countries to increase the use of GEF resources as investments where possible.

F)Stakeholders

2.1 A description of the approach and efforts to develop the stakeholder engagement during development has been included both in the Global Child Project and the Programme Framework Document after the related table.

## 2.3 The team plans to have further discussions with IEA and will keep the GEF Sec informed of the progress.

05/05/2023, UNEP

### General comments

1. Programme title and objective statement have been aligned.
2. Number of added countries has been clarified.
3. Statement has been revised.
4. Structural differences of GEF 7 and 8 have been clarified and diagram added.
5. The working group on charging infrastructure, renewable power integration and batteries is continued with a new focus on charging infrastructure, renewable power integration and sector coupling. In fact, more emphasis will be on charging network expansion in GEF 7 compared to GEF 8. This has been clarified throughout the document.
6. Description of the working groups and the global partnership on used EV trade, EV and battery end-of-life and circularity has been added highlighting the differences between the working groups and the partnership.
7. A diagram detailing the structural differences between GEF 7 and GEF 8 has been added (also to the Global Child Project concept).
8. Reference to utilities has been integrated, with regards to stakeholders targeted, their role in the transition and support needed.

### A) Theory of Change

1. Higher resolution versions of ToC and problem tree have been included, and a powerpoint document has been uploaded.
2. A brief narrative describing the problem tree and the ToC has been included addressing the requested elements.

### C) Components

1. C2 Components 1 and 2 have been better demarcated and an introductory statement has been included at the beginning of C2.
2. C3.1 The number cited in the review compares TA and INV including the Global Child Project, which is 100% TA. After removal of Kazakhstan from the submission, the INV portion amounts to US\$ 6.157 M. Compared to the total child project cost of US\$ 18.036 M for the 8 CPs submitted, the assumed INV share accounts for 34%.
3. C3.2 A paragraph has been added prior to the description of the components.
4. C 5 We have mapped the initial Country Child Project budgets with the Global Programme budget component by component. The programme results framework has been developed in such a way that all Country Child Projects will be able to report on each of the components? indicators, which are to be addressed at Country Child Project level. As such all offered indicators addressing the Country Child Projects are mandatory.

### D) Incremental cost reasoning

1. A brief paragraph has been added under the Programme Rationale, baselines sections of the PFD.

### G&F) Gender and Stakeholders

1. Noted.
2. 2.1 Stakeholders have been consulted as per Table 2 of the Global Child Project. An initial stakeholder mapping has been included in section ?Coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiatives and programmes? in the PFD, including a brief description of their potential role. Further consultations will be done during project development.

2.2 Descriptions of the roles of all co-implementing agencies have been added in the section on coordination.

2.3 IEA has not joined the Global Programme yet. Discussions to join the new programme started in December 2022. Further consultations are planned.

I) Policy coherence

1. A paragraph on policy coherence has been added to component 1, related to development of national planning frameworks and inter-ministerial coordination.

**5.2 Program coherence and consistency**

**a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?**

**b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

**c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?**

**d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?**

**e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?**

Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**05/12/23, FB**

---

**04/21/23, FB**

A) Please see question on Governance below ? this should be addressed in the context of the governance structure through adaptive management.

B) **Cleared.** This is well explained. Scaling up opportunities are clear.

C) **Cleared.** Yes, Child projects are set to contribute to Program's objectives.

D) Child projects differ between themselves in terms of components structure and outcome/indicators. Please elaborate briefly on the system that will be used at program level to collect data from child projects and roll indicator data up at program level, to contribute to the program level result tracking. Are Country project going to be able/asked to select between a predetermined list/menu of indicators correspondent to those tracked at Program level?

E) **Cleared.** Yes

Agency's Comments

UNEP, 08/05/2023

A) The governance structure has been further detailed under the 'Coordination and cooperation with on-going initiatives' section. It is also referenced under the mitigation measures of technical Design risk, under the 'Risks to achieving the Project Outcomes' table.

D) A detailed description is provided under the section on Monitoring and Evaluation. All Country Child Projects will be requested to submit identical e-mobility market tracking datasets as part of the annual PIR. A tracking template similar to the one under GEF-7 will be used.

### **5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs**

**a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**

**b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**05/12/23, FB**

---

**04/21/23, FB**

A) Description of the program level governance is missing, please elaborate on the governance structure, and include the diagram showing roles of the different organs (Advisory group, steering committee, etc). Also, elaborate briefly on the respective roles of the several co-implementing agencies. (Can use the governance section of the NZNPA IP as reference for this section.)

B) **Cleared**, the coordination with other GEF and non-GEF existing initiatives is well outlined.

#### Agency's Comments

UNEP, 08/05/2023

A) The programme governance structure is now described under the 'Coordination and cooperation with on-going initiatives' section.

### **5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting**

**a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**

**b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?

#### Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**05/15/23, FB**

1. ok

Comp 2, Q2. ok

Comp 3, Q2.3. ok

Comments on GEB calculations:

1. CI.6: Cleared. Additional work needed at PPG stage.

2. CI.9 on C&W Cleared. but GEF SEC is requesting the Agency that during PPG stage inclusion of the newly listed POPs is also investigated.

---

**05/12/23, FB**

**1. Please include higher res image of the results framework table.** The current one is hardly legible.

On indicators:

Component 1: Cleared.

Component 2:

1. Cleared.

**2. new indicator 2.2.4. should likely be in green** (not blue) since it is going to have to be monitored at child project level.

3. Cleared.

Component 3:

1. Cleared at this stage. Comment remains to be addressed at PPG stage.

2.1. Cleared.

2.2. Cleared.

2.3. **The indicator on #of financiers/Financial institutions is not found**, even though the answer below says it was added.

2.4. Cleared.

3. Cleared.

Component 4: Cleared.

Comments on GEB calculations:

1. CI.6: Cleared. Additional work needed at PPG stage.

2. CI.9: Pending inputs from C&W team.

D) Cleared.

E) Cleared.

---

**04/21/23, FB**

A, B & C)

## ON INDICATORS:

### Component 1:

1. Indicator 1.1.1 refers to knowledge products used by practitioners: (i) please clarify that these are knowledge products produced by the Program, and (ii) please clarify in the document how this indicator will be tracked.
2. Indicator 1.1.3 is the most important one under this Outcome, so suggest you bring it first. Also, a formulation that would track more accurately the outcome as presented is '# of *new or* improved national planning frameworks and/or institutions set up?'. Please consider revising accordingly.
3. Some indicators (e.g., 1.1.2, 1.2.3) look at the number of stakeholders applying a certain training. It may be relevant to clarify how they expect to track these indicators.

### Component 2:

1. Outcome 2.1: both indicators 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 track the # of countries (with new/revised policies or business models). It would be important to also track the overall number of new/revised policies (intended in a broad sense) and business models (which may need to be further defined) that the Global Program has supported. Please consider adding relative indicators to this end that child projects can contribute to and can be rolled up at Program level. Indicators 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 are good examples for Outcome 2.2, which could be reframed for Outcome 2.1.
2. Outcome 2.2 is missing an indicator to capture the # of business models/financing instruments/private sector initiatives related to EOL EVs/batteries that the Global Program has supported at national level through Child projects.
3. Outcome indicator for the investment portion is missing.

### Component 3

1. Indicators 3.1, 3.2, and 4.1 could be more specific or relevant to the project outcome. It is recommended to review them.
2. On 3.1:
  - Please clarify that the 'pilots' referred to are pilots supported by the Program (not general pilots) in the country. Can call them 'program-supported pilots', or similar.
  - recommend to add an indicator to track the # of program supported pilots (either by direct GEF investment or TA)
  - There should be an indicator to track the #of financiers/Financial institutions that invest in Program-supported pilots.
  - indicator 3.3: 'considered' is vague, how will this be determined? please revise to make it stronger. Suggest 'amount of public or private investment (in USD) leveraged/invested/committed as a consequence or in connection with the GEF Program?', this should be tracked at national (regional?) level and aggregated at program level.
3. Outcome indicator for the investment portion is missing.

### Component 4

1. Indicator 4.1: Please clarify how this differ from indicator 3.1 ? they seem formulated to very similar extents.

### The GEB calculations

#### **Core Indicator 6 needs work:**

please explain why the cost effectiveness of this program is significantly lower than the GEF7 one. In the first submission of the GEF 7 global program, the estimated emission reductions were 5.7 (direct) and 23.9 (indirect) mil tons CO<sub>2</sub>e, vs. a total GEF investment of 18.6 million. Duration of accounting was 15 years.

In the GEF8 program, GEF project financing of 29 mil (25 without CW) only yield 3.1 and 7.9 mil tons (direct and indirect respectively). Duration of accounting may be a factor but does not explain the difference entirely.

--> Please elaborate on reasons and review the calculations.

--> Please submit the calculation sheet.

**Core indicator 9 needs work:**

1. While the CW resources are being programed through the global coordination there should be the achievement of GEB?s under CI 9 and 10 at the country level which can roll up and be amplified by the global work. The GEB?s are almost non-existent for CW. For the amount of resources CW is providing we expect quantified and reasonable GEBs and an identification of the chemicals they expect to be managed/eliminated/phased out by the program.

2. The only number that is provided is 9.6 on POPs/ Mercury containing materials. If possible to amount of pure chemical POPs and mercury should be estimated and tracked in 9.1 and 9.2. Also the total should be added to 9.0. If there will be plastics avoided those should be estimated in 9.8.

D) Please add a short description of the additional socio-economic benefits (including on health/air pollution, job creation, economic opportunities, etc).

E) **Cleared.** Program-level M&E.

**Agency's Comments**

05/12/2023, UNEP

1. The Framework has been revised and we have tried to improve resolution. In case of the resolution is not good enough in the portal, we have included the programme indicators in a table in an uploaded excel as well.

**Component 2**

2. The new indicator 2.2.4 has been colored in green to be monitored at country level.

**Component 3**

We take note that some indicators could be further revised during PPG to be more specific.

**GEB calculations:**

1.CI6: We take note that it also needs to be further refined during PPG.

05/04/2023, UNEP

On indicators

**Component 1**

1. Clarified in the indicator. A paragraph on the tracking mechanism has been added to the PFD
2. Indicator has been moved up and revised.
3. A paragraph on the tracking mechanism has been added to the PFD

**Component 2**

1. Indicators 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 have been added as suggested
2. A new indicator on # of business models/financing instruments/private sector initiatives has been added as suggested
3. We have amended the GEF grant allocation in the *?Indicative Program Overview?* table, and there is no GEF grant going to investments under Component 2. The investment indicator is tracked under indicator 3.3.

**Component 3**

1. Noted, will be reviewed during development in consultation with the IAs.
2. Point 1 ? Clarified.

Point 2 ? Counting the number of pilots does not capture results, will revise during development

- Point 3 ? Indicator added as suggested

3. The investment leveraged is tracked with indicator 3.3, the 'INDICATIVE PROGRAM DESCRIPTION SUMMARY' table in the portal has been revised for more clarity.

Component 4

1. Indicator 3.1 is capturing the results of the programme pilots and measuring their success, indicator 4.1 is capturing the results beyond the pilots and measures to what extent these are shared with a broader audience

Core indicator 6

	# of countries	GEF project cost in million US\$	Direct emission reductions in tons of CO2	Indirect emission reductions in tons of CO2	GEF Effectiveness US\$ per ton CO2
GEF7 1st round	17	26.8	41,350,183	102,461,735	0.6
GEF7 1st round w/o India	16	21.4	3,697,183	14,627,735	5.8
GEF 7 2nd round	11	21.5	5,796,584	24,198,413	3.7
GEF 8 with KAZ	11	22.5	3,151,986	7,898,414	7.1
GEF 8 resubmission w/o KAZ	10	18.1	4,370,065	10,159,137	4.1

- Above table provides an overview of cost effectiveness for GEF 7 1st and 2nd round submissions as well as the current GEF 8 submission. Cost effectiveness as per GEF definition can be very high in big countries with high mitigation potential but is reduced when including smaller countries or a larger number of SIDS (with overall very small GHG emissions and therefore also small mitigation potential). The current submission includes three SIDS (Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu) which together receive 20% of the funding but contribute to only 4% of overall emission direct emission reductions. After removal of Kazakhstan for which emission reductions had been prepared by the EBRD team, and revision of GEF causality factors from 20% to 40% for Zambia, Zimbabwe and Azerbaijan the GEF 8 GHG mitigation is largely in-line with former submissions. Detailed calculations using the UNEP E-mob calculator will be prepared during project development. The current estimates can be found in the attached excel file.

Core indicator 9

1. Point 1: Since all CW funds are implemented through the global and no country project has yet requested for CW at the national level, all GEBs related to CW are accounted for at the global project level.

Point 2: The amount of pure chemicals avoided has been estimated from the hazardous materials containing mass reported under 9.6. It is estimated to 4.2 kg of PBDE (polybrominated diphenyl ethers) and reported under 9.1. The amount of POPs avoided



will be further investigated during project development and is likely to increase once the in-country activities will be better defined.

2. [The amount of pure PBDE has been estimated. The possible mitigation of other hazardous materials and plastics will be quantified during project development](#)

D) a short list of socio-economic benefits has been added under the GEF Core-Indicators table.

#### 5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

#### Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**05/12/23, FB**

**04/21/23, FB**

A) RISKS:

1. Risk are identified, but not all mitigation measures are well developed, and in fact most are missing. Please revise the risk registry to include sound description of relevant risk mitigation measures/approaches.

2. Climate Risk: Please also indicate that country child projects will have to conduct a full climate risk screening and adopt adequate risk management measures, including through adjustment in project design. Please also mention that child projects will have to follow STAP guidelines on climate risk screening for GEF projects.

B) Cleared.

C) Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

UNEP, 08/05/2023

A)

1. Mitigation measures have been added for all risks.

2. Thank you, these suggestions have been indicated as mitigation measures for the climate risks.

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

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

**\*For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Yes, the program is well aligned to CCM FA priorities, specifically with CCM 1-3 (Scale up zero-emission mobility of people and goods).

The Program is also aligned with GEF Chemicals and Waste Focal Area. Particularly with Objective 1: Creation, strengthening and supporting the enabling environment and policy coherence to transform the manufacture, use and sound management of chemicals and to eliminate waste and chemical pollution.

Agency's Comments

**b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Inclusion of child projects in the program is based on country demand.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Alignment with national and global priorities is well described.

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

This section is cleared, pending comments to be addressed in other question boxes.

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**8 Other Requirements**

**Knowledge Management**

**8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**9 Annexes**

**Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)**

**9.1 GEF Financing Table:**

**a) 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):**

**Country STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.  
04/21/23, FB  
Yes.

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.  
04/21/23, FB  
Amount requested is available.

Agency's Comments

**IP Set Aside**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

**IP Contribution**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

**For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)**

**b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program?**

**The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?**

**c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?**

**d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?**

**e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?**

**f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?**

**g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.  
05/15/23, FB**

---

**05/12/23, FB**

1. It seems no change was done (even though the response indicated this was adjusted). Please adjust the table for DRC.
2. Cleared.

**04/21/23, FB**

All cleared, except:

1. for DRC financing table, please revise the co-fin classification for the co-fin from Min Energy and Hydropower: recurrent expenditure are normally in-kind resources.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Energy and Hydropower (DRC)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	5,000,000.00
---------------------------------	---	----------------------	---------------------------	--------------

2. Same for the co-fin from Fiji and Vanuatu: grant should not be a recurrent expenditure.

Donor Agency	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) Australia (Fiji)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Donor Agency	GCF (Fiji)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Donor Agency	GCF (Vanuatu)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Donor Agency	MFAT (Vanuatu)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00

#### Agency's Comments

05/12/2023, UNEP:

1. The DRC child project co-finance has been amended now, the USD 5Millions are investment mobilized.

05/04/2023, UNEP:

1. Thank you. This was a typo in the portal, co-finance category has been amended in the portal and is consistent with the child project concept note for DRC now.
2. Co-finance categories have been amended both in the portal and child project concept notes for Vanuatu and Fiji, these grants are now indicates as Investment mobilized.

**9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

### 9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/21/23, FB

Yes.

Agency's Comments

### 9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/21/23, FB

Yes.

Agency's Comments

### 9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/21/23, FB

Yes.

Agency's Comments

### Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

04/21/23, FB

Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**05/12/23, FB**

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

**04/21/23, FB**

1. Please include LOE from Kazakhstan.

2. the title of the child project for Fiji is different between LOE and Portal. Please amend that in the portal (suggest to use "Fiji's E-Mobility Project" or to request for a revised LOE.

#### Agency's Comments

UNEP 05/04/2023

1. We have not received the letter of endorsement from Kazakhstan's GEF operational focal point at this stage. In agreement with EBRD, we have then removed Kazakhstan from this submission.
2. The government of Fiji has submitted a revised letter in April, the title "Sustainable Mobility in Fiji - Decarbonizing Public Buses" is consistent in the portal and the child project note.

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Program Locations**

**9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?**



Secretariat's Comments

**CLEARED.**

**04/21/23, FB**

Please include a map of the world marking the countries that are being included in the GEF8 program. (Could be good if possible to also mark the countries that are included in the GEF7 program ? not a requirement).

Agency's Comments

UNEP 05/04/2023

A map has been added including both GEF-7 and GEF-8 countries.

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes\* (\*only for non IP programs)**

**9.9 a) Does the program 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.**

**b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**Additional Annexes**

**10 GEFSEC Decision**

**10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the program recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

**05/15/23, FB**

The Program is recommended for technical clearance.

**05/12/23, FB**

Not yet, Agency is requested to please address the comments and resubmit.

**04/21/23, FB**

Not yet, Agency is requested to please address the comments and resubmit.

## Agency's Comments

### 10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

#### Secretariat's Comments

1. The share between TA and INV for the GEF component is approximately 24% or 34% depending on is the resources for the Global Child Project, which are 100% TA, are accounted for. The GEFSEC considers that while there is a strong additionality for the use of GEF resources as TA funds, there is also a strong case to use GEF resources as direct investments to re-risk and incentivize pilot activities. The Lead Agency is encouraged to work with Country Child Projects to increase the share of GEF resources used as INV, where possible, during PPG stage.
2. Some of the indicators presented at PFD approval had room for improvement with a view to be made more specific to the Programme's objective and respective outcomes (including indicators 3.1, 3.2 and 4.1, which only count the # of countries with pilots, not the results of the actions/investments that are generated). A revised results framework should be completed soon in the PPG stage to be adopted by all child projects. The Lead Agency committed to work on this during PPG.
3. On C&W Core Indicators: GEF SEC is requesting the Agency that during PPG stage inclusion of the newly listed POPs is also investigated.
4. On CI.6 (GHG emission reduction): additional work is needed at PPG stage.

## Agency's Comments

05/12/2023, UNEP

We take note of these improvements required during project development phase.

### 10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	4/21/2023	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	5/12/2023	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	5/15/2023	

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>