

Scaling-up the adoption of electric mobility in Tunisia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID	
10607	
Countries	
Tunisia	
Project Name	
Scaling-up the adoption of electric mobility in Tunisia	
Agencies	
UNIDO	
Date received by PM	
12/2/2021	
Review completed by PM	
3/15/2022	
Program Manager	
Filippo Berardi	
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 04/27/2022, FB

All comments cleared.

03/18/2022, PPO

1. Co-financing:

a. Ministry of Environment / GIZ (NDCs): change ?grant? to ?public investment?.

b. Actia: change ?other? to ?grant?

2. Core indicators:

- Please include explicit mention of the target for Core Indicator 11 in the Project Results Framework in Annex A.

3. On part of Table in Section 7 ? Consistency with National Priorities is off the margins ? please ask the Agency to amend:

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below: NAPAS, NAPS, ASGM NAPS, MIAS, NBSAPS, NCS, TNAS, NCSAS, NIPS, PRSPS, NPFE, BURS, INDCS, etc.

The project is consistent with the national strategies, plans and assessments given in the table below.

Policy	Year	Implementing Agency	Targets relevant to project activi ties	
The strategy of transition towards the green economy	2014-2030	Various	of development by 2030: agriculture tourism with a total investment volu ore than 200 thousand jobs by 2030. For the transport sector, this strategy For the transport sector, we aim to Increase the share of public transpo- Increase the share of rail multimod. Reducing the cost of transport to 12	ams to : r to 50%. I transpott (RFR,) o of GDP
	2010	Ministry of Transport	An destants sederation errors	

4. On PPG Utilization:

a. The way the table is presented lacks key information as the Agency did not use the GEF format. There is no detailed information on each of the activities presented as it requested in the GEF template.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

b. Most of the activities (excepting the first one) are grouped in one budgeted amount (\$38,000). The \$12,000 budgeted for *HACT assessment of proposes EAs* apparently was not spent, yet the activity was considered done ? one does not know whether this activity was paid with other resources or if the GEF resources are committed to cover it. The spent amount of all the activities that start with ?*pre-feasibility studies to select the electric urban freight solution?*? is lower than the budgeted amount as well, which is fine as long as one could see whether there is any committed amount. There is a note explaining that the gap of \$17,264 (50,000 ? 32,736) ?*will be spent on technical expert and coordinator expert to address potential GEF comments after submission*? ? as this activity is already known, it must be included so the amount (\$17,624) is included in the column ?committed?. The Agency is requested to clarify the points above and amend.

HACT assessment of proposed EAs Pre-feasibility studies to select the electric urb an freight solution and determine the low-carb on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency Development of ESMP	ount (USS)	t To date	September 2020 – September 202 1 September 2020 – November 202	nt submission (Done or remark Done Internal Self HACT assess ment is conducted. The capacity o f the project executing entity has been found adequate. Done. The project will provide T
Pre-feasibility studies to select the electric urb an freight solution and determine the low-carb on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency			1 September 2020 – November 202	Done Internal Self HACT assess ment is conducted. The capacity o f the project executing entity has been found adequate.
Pre-feasibility studies to select the electric urb an freight solution and determine the low-carb on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency			1 September 2020 – November 202	ment is conducted. The capacity o f the project executing entity has been found adequate.
an freight solution and determine the low-carb on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency	38,000	32,736		f the project executing entity has been found adequate.
an freight solution and determine the low-carb on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency	38,000	32,736		
an freight solution and determine the low-carb on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency	38,000	32,736		Done. The project will provide T
on transportation investments Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency				
Development of detailed ToRs for the national executing agency			1	A assistance through e-mobility d
executing agency				emonstration project in Djerba, Bi zerte and Sfax based on the result
executing agency				s of the pre-feasibility study devel
executing agency				oped by UNIDO and stakeholder
executing agency				consultations.
				Done. ToR for national execution
Development of ESMP				is developed, the comments from
Development of ESMP				Procurement integrated.
				Done. ESMP is developed and sha red along with the submission pac
				kage.
Verifying the baseline data on transport and R				Done.
E Consultation and confirmation of project partn				Done.
ers				
Establishment of the precise nature of the EV-				There will be four (4) types of pil
RE pilot demonstrations				ots for the municipalities: the intr oduction of e-bikes rental stations,
				charging infrastructure for EV's p
				owered by solar PV systems, a de
				ployment of EVs for the municipa
				lity fleet (including waste manage
				ment vehicles) and the introductio n of electric taxis. Each municipal
				ity defined its needs in terms of E
				Vs in respect to its budget and stra
				tegic orientation.
Development of detailed ToRs and approach f				Done (equivalent activity). The pr
or private sector participation in the purchase				oject will provide TA assistance to
of the chosen e-mobility infrastructure (in con				e-mobility solutions on the results
sultation with financing partners)				of the pre-feasibility studies devel
				oped by the project execution enti ty and stakeholder consultations.
		L	l	
Initial feasibility study to compare location-op				Done. The project will provide T
timization and appropriate business models for				A assistance through e-mobility d
the EV-RE pilot demonstrations				emonstration project in Djerba, Bi zerte and Sfax based on the result
				s of the pre-feasibility study devel
				oped by UNIDO and stakeholder
				consultations.
Calculations of Emissions avoided, Energy sa				Done.
ved and Increase in installed renewable energy				
capacity targets				
Development of the gender mainstreaming str				Done. Gender Analysis and action
ategy and review of the project design by a ge nder expert				plan are developed and shared alo ng with the submission package.
Development of monitoring plan				Done.
Stakeholder consultations and workshop to ver				Done. The project team conducted
ify the CEO approval document				inception and validation worksho
				p as well as consultations and bila
				teral meetings with diverse stakeh
				olders. Feedback is integrated into
Formal validation of the CEO approval docum			May - November 2021	Done.
ent, UNIDO Internal review and submission to				
GEF Sec				
	50,000	32,736		

5. On budget Table: there are three different types of budget tables in Annex E in Portal: the first type (one table) is a *summary budget per activity*, the second type (one table) presents the activities budgeted *per year*, the third type (five tables) presents the activities budgeted *per project component, M&E and PMC*. While the last type follows the GEF format, being presented in 5 different tables makes the reader to manually calculate the amounts. Though we could have waited till the resubmission, we did the manual calculations and there are no comments on the budget. However, the Agency should present only <u>one</u> consolidated table presenting the activities budgeted *per project component, M&E and PMC.*

FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, the project is well aligned with the focal area strategy.

Agency Response Agency Response (26 Apr 22)

1. Co-financing

a. Done. Ministry of Environment / GIZ (NDCs): changed from ?grant? to ?public investment?.

b. Done. Actia: changed from ?other? to ?grant?

2. Done. The target for Core Indicator 11 was explicitly mentioned in the Project Results Framework in Annex A.

3. Done. The format of the table in Section 7 ? Consistency with National Priorities has been updated to fit the margins of the Portal.

4. Done. The format of the PPG Utilization report has been updated in line with the comments above and re-introduced in the respective annex.

5. Done. The format of the budget table has been updated and a summary has been introduced in the respective annex of the CEO document. The detailed budget with more information on activity level is too large to be inserted in the text box and has been uploaded in Excel format as an attachment to the CEO to allow for easier check of the calculations.

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 03/07/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Please address the comments below:

- Regarding 1.1.3.: We would encourage the agency to revise the target indicator from "One draft policy or regulatory framework" to "one finalized policy or regulatory framework is submitted for adoption/approval by the competent actor(s) to the decision making body"
- 2. Regarding Component 2, we invite you to include data collection and analysis as part of the pilot demonstration to extract lessons learned and strengthen decision making.
- 3. Component 2 includes elements of TA and of INV. This should be reflected in the classification of the type of financing.
- 4. The name of component 3 refers to "low-carbon electric mobility": this is confusing. Does it refers to the expected use of hybrid vehicles? please clarify.
- Regarding Output 3.1.1, please specify why "four other cities in Tunisia" will be targeted? Is it four cities additional to the cities targeted under Component 2 (i.e. Sfax, Bizerte and Djerba)? If so, have you identified these four additional cities.

Agency Response

1. Target indicator changed in Project result framework

2. It is now specified in the text under Component 2 and in activities description.

3. Only one can be selected on the Portal so it is now twice copied to allow both to show

4. The project focuses on electric vehicles, not hybrid. Low carbon is mentioned in the titles of all three first components to refer to the final objective of the project "reducing CO2 emissions".

5. Tunis, Sfax, Bizerte and Djerba are the cities targeted but other cities could be targeted like Sousse which mobility programme is advanced or Medenine, Soukra and Nabeul are all interested in these activities. "Other" is now removed to avoid confusion.
3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Please address the comments below:

- The co-finance letter from the National School of Advanced Science and Technology amounts to EUR 167,104.73. Please correct the corresponding amount in USD in Table C in the Portal and include the exchange currency employed in the ?Describe how any Investment Mobilized was identified? section after Table C.
- Regarding the co-finance letter from ACTIA Africa, there is a mismatch between the amount provided in the co-finance letter and the amount reported in the Portal. Moreover, please elaborate or revise why this is considered an equity co-finance.
- 3. The ?Ministry of Environment/GIZ (NDCs)? co-finance letter, needs to be issued by the entity that provides the cofinancing, as per the GEF guidelines. If possible, please indicate the co-financing amount in USD in the co-financing letter. Else, please indicate the corresponding amount in USD in Table C in the Portal and include the exchange currency employed in the in the ?Describe how any Investment Mobilized was identified? section after Table C.
- 4. Regarding the co-financing letter from the National Agency for Energy Management (ANME), please clarify what is meant with the ?subsidy? that will be provided. We would appreciate if you could address it in the ?Describe how any Investment Mobilized was identified? section after Table C.

5. Regarding the co-finance letter from UNIDO, please indicate the period in which this co-finance will be provided.

Agency Response

1. Done

2. As already mentioned in the Portal under how investments have been identified, only part of this co-financing is considered eligible for the 'Please note that only part of the amount of the ACTIA letter was found relevant to the project and taken into account. We estimate that only USD1,813,635 will co-finance directly the project activities. Should additional co-financing be mobilized throughout the implementation of the project, it will be reported in the PIRs as well as reflected in the MTR and TE reports.

3. The letter was issue by the Ministry of Environment, the entity that provides the cofinancing. The amount could not be mentioned in USD. As for the previous comment, the UN rate for August was used and directly calculated on the system. Corresponding amount in USD is already in Table C.

4. Addressed under the section. As specified by ANME: The "subsidy" amounts are amounts that will be granted by ANME as grants from the Energy Transition Fund (ETF) to the municipalities involved in the programme.

5. Revised letter uploaded.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, resources are adequate to meet project objectives.

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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

A report for the PPG activities and available balances is provided. However:

1. A portion of the PPG amount is still unspent, please indicate if this will be spent before the policy deadline (within one year of the CEO endorsement).

Agency Response All remaining funds are allocated and will be spent within a year of the CEO endorsement. 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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Please address the comments below based on the GHG emission calculator workbook ?Others_EMOB-LDV-Calculator - Tunisia LFQFinal02122021.xlsx?:

1. Regarding ?For validating? tab:

- 1. Please clarify or correct if the ?Vehicle stock? data source used is from Antigua and Barbuda
- Regarding ?Tested FE gasoline hybrid? and ?Tested FE gasoline PHEV?, please clarify why the following data source was used ?Energy consumption of electric vehicles based on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing q??
- 3. Similarly, regarding ?Tested FE BEV?, please clarify why the following data source was used ?Energy consumption of electric

vehicles based on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing q??

- 4. Regarding ?Vehicle prices?, please clarify why the following data source was used ?Based on ICCT for Bangkok?? EV prices between countries may vary significantly.
- 5. Regarding ?Vehicle maintenances?, please clarify or correct the use of ?Based on 30% the maintenance cost of a conventional bus and two battery replacements?. Since this is a light-duty vehicle calculation it is not recommended to use assumptions from heavy-duty vehicles.
- 6. Regarding ?Electricity CO2 footprint?, please clarify or correct the use of ?Analysis of the grid emission factors for the electricity sector in the Caribbean countries?. Electricity grid emission factors are country specific.
- 2. Regarding ?Input? tab:
 - The annual GDP does not seem to match with Tunisia?s annual GDP. For example, according to the World Bank Data Bank (https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations= TN), the GDP of Tunisia in 2020 accounted for USD 39.24 billion. However, the excel workbook uses a GDP of USD 162.44 billion for the same year. This a considerable difference, please revise and correct accordingly.

Agency Response

1.1: We have been using the electric mobility calculator as a common methodological approach for calculating the CO2 reductions and the energy savings from the implementation of electric mobility programs at national level. The ?validating? tab is a summary of the data source we have used to perform the CO2 and energy estimations. For the case of Tunisia, the source that was used for the vehicle stock was the MRV Tunisia in 2016. Data for previous years have been calculated from yearly vehicule sales ans estimated yearly vehicules brakage. This source is updated in the ?validation? tab. 1.2 & 1.3: Local input data for running the models is not available. Under that situation, we have used other reports as reference to get input data. For the gasoline and diesel LDVs the fuel economy values were get from ?Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of Global Environment Facility Transportation Projects?. However, for the case of HEV and PHEV the fuel economy values were not available. Therefore, we decided to look for a research report that can compare both technologies under the same driving patterns. As a result we found the paper ?Energy consumption of electric vehicles based

on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing?. This paper is published in the journal Applied Energy which is recognized journal in this field. The used fuel economy values for HEV and PHEV are in the range common values if we make a comparison with other sources (2021 fuel consumption guide). For the case of BEV, we have used as a reference the fuel economy from Nissan Leaf.

1.4 & 1.5: Indeed vehicle prices and maintenance cost can vary between countries. However, due to the technology, in some countries there is not a specific reference for the country. In these cases, we decided to run the model with Light-duty electric vehicle data from ICCT that is an organization recognized for its scientific rigor. If accurate and local data is available, the estimation of the Total Cost of Ownership can be updated. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that this input data do not affect the estimation results in terms of CO2 reductions and energy savings.

1.6 : As explained in comment 1, we adopted the electric mobility calculator as a common methodological approach for calculating the CO2 reductions and the energy savings from the implementation of electric mobility programs at national level. The ?Electricity CO2 footprint? source for (country) was (name of the source) and we have to update it in ?validating? tab.

2.1 : We have used the GDP PPP (purchasing power parity). The source for for this data is the World Energy Outlook 2018. Please find attached the excel file. I have done a double check with the world bank source and for 2019 they have published 133 billion and the world economy outlook published 152 billion. These figures are closer than the figures in the comment.

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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

 It is mentioned that "only 3% of grid capacity is supplied through renewable energy". The climate change mitigation potential of electric mobility adoption and scale-up will be negatively impacted unless coupled with the decarbonization of the electricity mix ? especially, when considering that electricity demand is growing fast. Therefore, we invite you to revise your root causes and barriers and consider including/addressing this as one of the barriers to e-mobility adoption.

2. It is also mentioned "the presence of large natural gas reserves in Tunisia and already realized projects with individual taxis and buses", in reference to switch to natural gas for transportation. Are there specific barriers to e-mobility adoption given this situation? Please elaborate.

Agency Response

1. Indeed. The low rate of renewable energy in the electricity mix is added as a barrier to mitigate GHG emission with e-mobility (Added in the barriers list).

2. It reinforce the barrier "Low price gap in energy cost", since electricity not only compete with fuel but also with gas. Added in the document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Please address comment below:

1. The second paragraph of this sub-section mentions the following: "The national electricity consumption is expected to double by 2015, at an annual growth rate of 5%.[14]". Given that 2015 has already occurred, we invite you to update this figure.

Agency Response 1. Indeed, it is expected to double by 2035, not 2015. Added in the document.

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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

there is a good description of the alternative scenario. However, please address the following points:

1. It is clear that the baseline scenario shows dependence on fossil fuel for electricity generation. Please clarify what (if any) role the project has with respect to the integration of renewable energy in the grid, including possibly ways to connect directly RE to charging stations/networks.

2. Considering the need to participate to the development of the national strategy on electric mobility for Tunisia under Output 1.1.2, we invite the Agency to consider increasing the frequency of the National Electric Mobility Coordination Unit (NEMCU) meetings (currently bi-annual) to ensure early engagement of all the participating stakeholders and a thorough consultation process.

3. Regarding output 1.1.2: This is a key element of the project as it will provide a decision making tool to support the roll out of the policy measures. It should include an analysis of the cost-benefits from different scenarios of penetration levels/speeds of EVs in the country, with corresponding socio economic impacts (e.g. new jobs vs loss in 'old/brown' jobs), in addition to GHG emission reductions, making an economic case for a swift transition.

Regarding Output 1.1.3:

3a. Could you provide more detail about which policies and regulatory frameworks will be revised and which measures will be implemented? We invite you to elaborate more to provide a better picture of the actions that will be taken.

3b. Please explain how you will ensure that the "drafted policy will be ready for adoption"?

4. Regarding Component 2:

4a. The document states that "Since their levers of action is very low on public transport, project pilots aim to integrate electric bike services in all municipalities." Please clarify this statement and provide more details on how this segment of e-mobility was selected, as opposed to others like public buses. We invite you to elaborate more on the reasoning behind focusing on "electric vehicles in the municipality fleet, the development of electric bikes rental stations and electric charging stations, and the facilitation of electric taxis purchases". The document would benefit from a brief

explanation of the analysis behind the selection of these alternatives and key project focus.

4b. Additional elements that should be indicated regarding component 2 are:

i - If a market study was carried out to determine prices and availability of EVs and charging infrastructure equipment on the local market, to feed into the feasibility studies under 2.1.1

ii - Clearer definition of roles and responsibilities for the pilot projects should be explained

iii - Duration of pilots and exit strategies should be indicated

iv - Focus on data gathering, monitoring and analysis from the pilots should be prioritized as opportunity for learning and informing the scale up/exit

5. Regarding output 2.1.2:

- The figures expressed in the table do not coincide with the text preceding it. For example, in the text, it is said that "Sfax expects to invest more in two wheelers technologies with 135 e-bikes and 100 motorcycles". However, the table mentions 60 e-bikes and 15 e-motorcycles. Please clarify.
- 2. A partnership is mentioned. We invite you to elaborate more in this regard and explain how each demonstration project will be carried in each city.
- 3. Please clarify if consultations with potential technology providers or operators have been conducted. Earlier in the document, it is mentioned that "first private vehicles making their entry only in 2020. [11]". Thereby, it is crucial to ensure that the different electric vehicles and charging infrastructure that the pilot demonstration will require will be available during the project implementation at a cost within reach.
- 4. Please elaborate on the exit strategy of the pilot demonstration projects after their implementation.
- 5. It is mentioned that the "The component (2) will also generate data to support policymaking and generate experiences and lessons learned for other cities, thus creating confidence and momentum towards a broad electrification of this sector. The demonstrations will be scaled up later on through Component 3." Please elaborate how monitoring and verification of the pilots will be carried to ensure that the previous statement is accomplished.

Agency Response

1. The role of the project regarding RE is more detailed in the introduction of this part. The use of RE is adressed in activities 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. In activity 2.1.1, RE are included in the pilots with smartcharging. A sentence is added to precise that charging stations will be deployed will PV power plant. The project will demonstrate the coupling of RE with EV.

2. The NEMCU meetings will be bi-annual but stakeholders parts of NEMCU will also be involved in other activities related to the strategy, the drafting of the policy (consultations, validation workshops), the validation of the pilots, as well as the capacity activities planned under Component 3. It was decided with the Ministry of Environment and the PEE, ANME, that it would be complicated to involve more the stakeholders and require more than 2 meetings per year in addition of all other activities. In any case, adhoc meetings if judged necessary could take place.

3. The mention of several scenarios is added, as weel as the analysis it should include. This was an omission in the previous version.

3a. The legal and administrative barriers will be specifically identified in order to design a new policy. A non-exhaustive list of subjects regarding the policies is described in the project document. It will be assessed during implementation through stakeholders consultation and based on the strategy as well, which policy and regulatory frameworks will be reviewed. The situation is evolving fast in Tunisia. For example, since January 2022, there is no import tax on EVs anymore (project document has been updated on this point).

3.b: PEE will ensure that the draft policy will be ready for adoption by engaging the relevant stakeholders through the whole design process (consultations, validation workshops involving key stakeholders to provide inputs at the different drafting stage).4a. Additionnal explanation are added on public transport and cycling strategies.

This part is re-aranges and few other information are added.

4b.i A mention is added regarding market study.

4b.ii The pilots will be managed (monitored) by ANME and the commune concerned. ANME will be in charge of launching the calls for tender for feasibility studies and equipment acquisition. All the details will be defined in an agreement between the 2 parties. The municipalities will participate with ANME in the development and validation of the specifications and will also participate in the monitoring and acceptance of the work and will ensure the smooth running of the projects thereafter. 4b.iii The duration is added for each type of pilot

4b.iv Information are added on data gathering, monitoring and analysis

5.1. Project targets are lower than expectation of municipalities, since co-financing are not all secured. This is mentioned above the table.

5.2 Detailed on organization (including possible partnerships) are added. At the moment, no method is specific to a city.

5.3 Stakeholder consultation as shown that several providers and operators are interested and could respond to the need. Procurement costs calculated already include possible import cost of technologies if not all is available locally by the time of the project implementation. Since first submission of project, new actors are selling EVs in 2022 and situation is evolving fast.

5.4. More details are added in the document on exit strategy

5.5. Details are added in 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Alignment is observed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, the project document outlines incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline and co-financing.

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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, the project is aligned with the methodology used under the GEF7 e-mobility program for all child projects.

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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

- In terms of sustainability, as mentioned in the comment related to Output 2.1.2, the Agency is invited to consider an exit strategy for the pilot demonstration projects to ensure continuation and scaling of activities after project completion.
- 2. Regarding scalability, aside from the cities' interest and commitments and interest, please elaborate on how the project will ensure replicability and scaleup by building on the pilot demonstration projects.
- 3. Also related to scalability, we agree that capacity-building activities under Component 3 could be replicated for other localities. Nonetheless, this would require additional resources to conduct these trainings. A more cost-effective alternative would be to build capacities among local stakeholders to train other persons by using a train the trainer approach. Please consider including this in the project design.

Agency Response

1. Exit strategy is detailed in 2.1.2.

Replicability and scale-up will be ensured through engagement from local stakeholders in targeted cities but also from other cities and nationally, data collection, lessons learned. The component 3 is also dedicated to scale up thanks to training workshops (we added as well train the trainer workshops to ensure local replicability), professional competency will also be strengthened, knowledge product developed to enhance awareness. To facilitate continued investment, project?s pipeline for financing options will be assessed and a concept note will be prepared for one scale up option.
 Indeed, we agree. Added in the project document.

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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, project coordinates for the targeted cities have been provided.

Agency Response Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

The relation with and contribution to the Global Program are well explained.

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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, a stakeholder consultation report during the design stage has been provided. It includes an adequate stakeholder engagement plan.

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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, gender analysis has been completed, and an action plan has been laid out.

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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, the private sector will be a key stakeholder in the project. Private sector representatives were consulted during the design stage and are expected to be consulted to provide inputs to the project. Moreover, the project will assist in strengthening municipalities' preparedness to attract private investments.

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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

The document includes a good risk catalogues and mitigation measures. Please address the following comments:

1 Regarding "Environmental and social risk", please elaborate on what is meant with the following statement: "Demonstration projects include several sub-projects that have different risks on environmental and social point of view, so that risks may be mitigated by enforcing a sub-project rather than another."

2. Regarding the climate risk: the document include a section on climate risk analysis. It does not however include any statement on how the projected risk will be taken into account in the project design/implementation to ensure mitigation actions are taken, where possible. Please address this point.

Agency Response

1. Having several sub-project implies that a issue that affects one sub-project would not affect the other one. It creates a resilience of the entire project, where it becomes possible to enhance one sub-project if another subproject must be cancelled or reduced. Text was modified in the document.

2. This section was written at the end of the "Risks" chapter, whereas impact on the project and mitigation measures are written in the table. The section on climate risk is moved before the table on risk assessment and mitigation **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 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Yes, the institutional arrangements have been described. The National Agency for Energy Conservation (ANME), will be the Executing Agency of Components 1 to 3. ANME and UNIDO will jointly execute the monitoring and evaluation activities under Component 4.

1. Please include in the institutional arrangement a reference to the modalities of engagement with the Global e-Mobility Program.

Agency Response This has been mentioned and highlighted in the section. 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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, the project is consistent with national priorities.

Agency Response Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/09/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Yes, a KM approach is described. However,

1. please include a timeline for the implementation/execution of the key deliverables described in the section.

Agency Response Done. 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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, a M%E plan is included and budgeted.

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 FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Yes, socioeconomic benefits and how those results in GEBs have been described in the document.

Agency Response Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

Required annexes are included.

Agency Response Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared.

A PRF was included.

Agency Response GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/09/2022, FB

Comments received by Council have been included in the portal. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Please add responses to the comments received by council at the time of the approval of the PFD. (Agency can consult for reference other child projects endorsed so far on this point and adapt to the national circumstances as needed).

Agency Response Responses to Council comments added. The rest of Annex B has been uploaded at the time of the submission of the CEO document (Roadmap -> Document). STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/09/2022, FB

Comments received by STAP have been included in the portal. Cleared.

FB, 12.17.2021

Please add responses to the comments received by STAP at the time of the approval of the PFD. (Agency can consult for reference other child projects endorsed so far on this point and adapt to the national circumstances as needed).

Agency Response It is not possible to introduce all tables so the rest of Annex B has been uploaded at the time of the submission of the CEO document (Roadmap -> Document). Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared. A status report on the utilization of the PPG was submitted. While there are still available balances, the Agency has up to one year from the endorsement to commit and disburse such balances.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request FB, 12.17.2021

Cleared. Maps were included.

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 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 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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/22/22:

The Agency is requested to address the additional comments provided by PPO and resubmit.

03/09/2022, FB

All comments have been addressed. The PM recommends the clearance for CEO Approval.

FB, 12.17.2021

Not yet. Agency is requested to submit responses and address the points raised above.

** Please highlight in yellow the changes made on the portal version of the CEO approval document for ease of reference. **

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project is implemented by UNIDO and is executed by the *Agence Nationale Pour La Maitrise De l'Energie* (ANME). The project is requesting US\$1,784,862 from GEF and has a co-finance contribution of \$11 million.

The project's objective is to scale up and catalyze the adoption of electric mobility across Tunisia resulting in GHG emission reductions, and position the country as a logistic hub for the region. The project will focus on mobility and connectivity in Tunisia and will put the country on a path towards low-carbon transportation infrastructure development, thus mitigating climate change impact and improving urban air quality and public health. The project will provide technical assistance and facilitate investment mobilization for pilot demonstration in three sites in Tunisia (Bizerte, Djerba, Sfax). The project is expected to result in GHG emission reduction of 5,119,905 tCO_{2eq} (direct + indirect).

The project has four components:

- 1. Institutionalization of low-carbon electric mobility
- 2. Demonstration of low-carbon e-mobility solutions
- 3. Preparing for scale-up and replication for long-term sustainability of lowcarbon electric mobility
- 4. Monitoring and Evaluation

COVID-19 analysis: COVID-19 pandemic can have a severe risk on the health of the project team, stakeholders, and beneficiaries. The restrictions due to the pandemic had a significant impact on tourism sector. The assumptions are that the economic and health impact of the pandemic will be gradually reduced starting from 2022 thanks to vaccinations and a normalization of economic and social activity.

Risks associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are as follows:

- •- Further project evolution in implementation phase cannot be executed as per expected timelines due to the pandemic, leading to a delay in implementation
- Availability of Technical Expertise and Capacity and Changes in Timelines
- •- Stakeholder Engagement Process
- Enabling environment, focused on the country?s energy deficit
- •- Financing (National debt crisis, availability of co-financing, price increases in procurement)

•

Opportunities associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are as follows:

- Innovation in climate change mitigation and engagement with the private sector
- •- \$300 million in financing for the COVID-19 Emergency Response Project for Social Protection approved by the World Bank Group
- •- The Ministry of Development, Investment and International Cooperation (MDICI) is setting up a Private Sector Support Unit (UASP Covid-19) to support Tunisian and

foreign investors during the deconfinement process and thus contribute to the coordination of government action