

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11577
Project title	Implementation of Sustainable Transport Solutions in Togo
Date of screen	11 May 2026
STAP Panel Member	Ngonidzashe Chirinda, Mark Stafford Smith and Jon Barnett
STAP Secretariat	Aderiana Mbandi and Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP considers the project to have sound scientific and technical merit, particularly in its strong systems framing that links climate risks, transport, finance, and urban development through a coherent “flood-and-carbon trap” narrative. The baseline analysis is well articulated, and the identification of under-resourced gaps in nature-based drainage, sustainable transport corridors, financing mechanisms, and knowledge systems is clear. The project components are generally robust and technically grounded, and likely to benefit the country.

However, STAP identifies several concerns that should be addressed in design refinement. The robustness of the overall approach could be strengthened by applying a simple future narratives approach to explore uncertainties in key interacting drivers. The theory of change relies on assumptions regarding institutional coordination, financial sector behaviour, and stakeholder responses that are not fully elaborated, nor are the plans for monitoring and adaptive management. Greater attention is needed to address behavioural change, informality in the transport sector, circularity considerations, and gender-inclusive capacity building. Addressing internal data inconsistencies, indicator errors and omissions, including conflicting output targets, unclear finance leverage figures, will further strengthen the project's credibility.

STAP's assessment*

- Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit
- Minor** - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design
- Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The proposal articulates a coherent systemic framing through its "flood-and-carbon trap" concept, showing convincingly how demographic pressure, policy fragmentation, financial barriers, and climate dynamics interact and reinforce one another rather than treating them as separate problems. However, the final design must ensure consistent outputs. For example, the 100-home retrofits; the drainage distance (10-15 vs 15 km); 5,000-6,000 vs 5,000-10,000 e-motos; BRT vs BRT-ready/e-bus/NMT scope and the 30 ha wetlands/320 ha land indicators. Specifically, the proponents should ensure that each output has one quantity, footprint, responsible entity, safeguards scope and indicator.

Uncertain Futures: The project addresses future uncertainty through the use of climate projections but does not develop clear alternative future narratives that encompass other major drivers of change, such as population growth, economic performance, or technological change (and their interactions), limiting the assessment of how proposed interventions perform under different plausible futures. For example, different combinations of unfavourable institutional reforms, behaviour change, and private sector uptake could lead to markedly different outcomes, to which a good project should be robust. Also, the future could be characterized by slow private-

sector uptake, weak municipal enforcement, delayed partner lending, low e-moto adoption, unresolved informality and maintenance failures. Reflections on these simple future narratives should inform the design of interventions and help identify potential risks to delivery. While the options considered in the table on page 28 is useful, the project design could be strengthened by developing a narrative of plausible futures based on the different drivers and identifying interventions that are robust to the different futures. See [STAP's Simple Future Narratives Primer](#) for how to do this.

Baseline, Outcomes, Barriers and Enablers: The baseline is well described, and the incremental logic is clearly identified through three under-resourced gaps: NbS drainage & BRT corridors, Financing, and Knowledge systems. The logical connection between removing identified barriers and achieving the stated outcomes could be strengthened, for example, by providing a stronger argument rather than assuming that reducing borrowing costs through the PCGF will be sufficient to shift developer behaviour, given that cultural familiarity with conventional building construction and weak enforcement capacity are also acknowledged constraints.

Theory of change: The ToC diagram articulates a sequential four-lever logic which provides some coherent causal architecture. However, the causal pathways are based on some assumptions that are not identified as such and not elaborated, notably that banks will honour lending pledges once the first-loss cushion is in place; that ministries will sustain coordination after the inter-ministerial committee is established; that informal moto-taxi drivers will become bankable borrowers and that developers will respond to fast-track permitting/property tax incentives despite acknowledged enforcement capacity gaps. The proposal also assumes that enough women-led firms, youth enterprises, women mechanics and driver cooperatives are available, interested, eligible and creditworthy. There is a need to provide evidence to support that these assumptions will hold true, and this should be reflected in the theory of change. Appropriate monitoring and mitigation measures need to be in place and reflected in the implementation risks if they do not hold.

In addition, pages 38 ('key conditions for success') and 55-56 list a range of other assumptions – that “the first batch of guarantee-backed leases will prove their commercial case”, that “bank pipelines will stay full and administrative costs will remain low” due to the e-permit system, that there is sufficient interest among women to fill the 20% carve out and 30% KPI. Whatever is considered critical (or uncertain) among these key assumptions should be explicitly incorporated into the ToC and monitored through the results framework, risk table, and quarterly adaptive management reviews.

In addition, the ToC does not give sufficient attention to the behavioural and cultural changes required: for example, why would moto-taxi drivers, construction firms, municipal officials, and the labour force shift practices? Are incentives sufficient to change behaviour? What incentives will ensure ministerial silos work together? In the case of the latter, the proponents may need to specify the mechanism IMCC will use to overcome ministerial silos. Options could include binding MoUs, shared annual workplan targets, joint sign-off on designs and orders, budget-linked responsibilities etc.

Furthermore, STAP recommends that the Theory of Change (ToC) consider the full set of causal pathways needed to achieve the overall goal, not only those addressed by the project itself. This helps identify complementary actions required beyond the project, thereby clarifying where coordination with other projects, programs, or actors is necessary to achieve the intended outcomes ([see STAP's Theory of Change Primer](#)). That said, STAP welcomes the careful attention given to coordination mechanisms, including those outlined in the table on page 35. STAP also appreciates the proposal's strong consideration of scaling pathways, particularly the plans to engage other cities and extend learning beyond the initial project locations, as reflected on page 57.

Project components: The components are well described in the document, with technical standards, financial structures, and engineering parameters generally well-grounded. There are, however, some inconsistencies introduced from a revision which drops Output 2.2, which is retained in other portions of the document; similarly, p.32 suggests (twice) that the GEF funds contribute to capitalising the first-loss tier of the PCGF, whilst elsewhere (p.49/52) it is made clear this role is filled by BOAD/FOGAR-Climat. In component 3, it would be good to reflect on how quickly there can be an adequate rate of return on leases, such as for e-mobility, since this is necessary

to demonstrate that the approach is working and incentivise further loans. Moreover, the leverage claims must be clear on whether they are co-finance, investment mobilised, senior loans or guarantee capital.

Some adaptation activities may not serve the most vulnerable. There may be little appetite among low-income households to raise their foundations if they lack security of tenure. It will be important to assess the tenure of the properties proposed. For the same reason, revising building codes may do little to help those most at risk, though that is not to say protecting the assets of those who can afford to raise their floors is not worth doing, since ultimately their flooding of such properties could become a public problem.

The proponents should strengthen vulnerability and tenure analyses in the target wards, identify the barriers faced by low-income, tenure-insecure households, and tailor adaptation measures accordingly. The project design should include community-level flood protection, nature-based solutions, participatory upgrading approaches that do not rely solely on individual household investments, subsidy or risk-sharing mechanisms, and safeguards to ensure that building-code enforcement does not exclude or penalise informal and low-income households.

On this issue, the proposal is also unclear as to activities and outcomes, as elsewhere it states that “the former 100 housing retrofits' pilot has been dropped (and its budget reallocated) to deepen the reach of the drainage works and the e-mobility package, exactly as agreed with the Government and reflected in the updated costs-by-component table” (Component 2, p 46). Some clarity about this would be helpful.

Bioswale drainage may be maladaptive if it displaces people living adjacent to roads, and poorly designed bioswales may lead to stagnant water that accumulates pollutants and serves as a vector for mosquito-borne diseases (see Almasalmeh et al., 2026; Brown et al., 2022). Assessments and consultation with communities that may be affected is necessary. The full proposal will also need to provide detailed technical standards for the design of the bioswale drainage systems to avoid maladaptation (see, for example, Payne et al. 2015).

Governance and results: It is encouraging to see that these issues have already been carefully considered, including the emphasis on “how to keep everyone moving in the same direction” (p.37). It will be important to ensure that these intentions are clearly communicated to and maintained by the implementation team so they are not lost during implementation.

More details should be added on how the flood control and GHG benefits were estimated. Specifically, a transparent benefit-estimation annex would be useful. In the case of flood benefits, the annex could include sea-level and rainfall scenarios, exposed assets/populations and depth-damage curves, etc. For GHG benefits, the annex should include baseline vehicle-km, modal-shift assumptions, e-moto duty cycles, bus ridership, grid emission factors, AFOLU sequestration, etc.

Stakeholders, lessons learned and knowledge management: The proposal does not adequately address the structural informality of Lomé's transport sector considering moto-taxi drivers largely operate outside formal employment and without the licensing frameworks and credit histories or collateral that formal financial institutions require, yet the PCGF e-moto lease model is premised on bankable borrowers with no explanation of how informal operators would be supported to meet eligibility criteria or whether cooperative and aggregator models might bridge this gap.

Building on the prior work under “Support the shift to Electric Mobility in Togo” (GEF 10272; GEF 7), the project should engage relevant stakeholders to explore the possibility of catalysing the establishment of local assembly or manufacturing plants for the e-motos, as this would strengthen socioeconomic and environmental outcomes and reduce long-term dependence on imported equipment and spare parts.

Gender and inclusion: It is good to see inclusion woven deeply into the proposal; however, it raises some questions. Whilst the Train-the-Trainer model is well-intentioned, selecting participants on the basis of seniority

risks excluding young mechanics who, in practice, constitute the primary e-moto servicing workforce and are most likely to champion “new” technologies. Working with Technical and Vocational Education and Training colleges (TVET) as institutional anchors, embedding e-mobility maintenance as an accredited curriculum module within existing apprenticeship frameworks could yield sustainable, lasting results and benefits. The proposal does not indicate whether there are sufficient interests and availability among women to fill the proposed mechanic and related roles. If this has been confirmed through stakeholder engagement, it would be useful to state this clearly. If not, it should be treated as an assumption to monitor during implementation and reflected in the risk table as a capacity-related risk. The proposal is also inconsistent in its treatment of youth and women – in some places, both groups are mentioned, while elsewhere only one is referenced. Given the country’s predominantly young population, the proposal should apply this framing more consistently and, where relevant, disaggregate data not only by gender, but also by age, for example, male and female youth.

Risk Table: this needs to acknowledge other key assumptions noted above, which are built into the design but still represent risks if they are not realised; in many cases, these require monitoring to allow rapid remedial action if not met.

References:

Almasalmeh, O., Roghani, B., Bahrami, M., Girot, E., Kapelan, Z. and Langeveld, J.G., 2026. Failure mechanisms in blue-green infrastructure: permeable pavements, bioswales and retention ponds in the Netherlands. *Blue-Green Systems*, 8(1), pp.41-60.

Brown, H.E., Keith, L., Madera-Garcia, V., Taylor, A., Ramirez, N. and Ogata, I., 2022. Greening up for mosquitoes: a comparison of green stormwater infrastructure in a semiarid region. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association*, 38(2), pp.109-112.

Payne, E.G.I., Hatt, B.E., Deletic, A., Dobbie, M.F., McCarthy, D.T. and Chandrasena, G.I., 2015. Adoption guidelines for stormwater biofiltration systems—Summary report. Cooperative Research Centre for Water Sensitive Cities, Melbourne. https://watersensitivecities.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/TMR_C1-1_AdoptionGuidelinesStormwaterBiofiltrationSystems.pdf

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

STAP recommends that the proponent address the points raised in Section 2 above, including the following specific issues:

- Revise the coastal-risk baseline and test the feasibility of mangrove restoration. There is evidence suggesting higher coastal erosion rates (up to ~5 m/year¹, compared to the 1–2 m/year cited) ([Guerrera et al. 2021](#)). Underestimating erosion rates could undermine the feasibility of mangrove restoration, a core nature-based flood solution. Moreover, the design of the mangrove restoration plan should specify suitable sites, hydrological conditions, sediment dynamics, survival assumptions and maintenance responsibilities etc.
- Quantify the Urban Heat Island effect. The Urban Heat Island effect is identified as a driver; quantifying its magnitude would strengthen the mitigation case for cool roofs and green corridor interventions. Ideally, a future narrative that considers climate change as a core driver will take these issues into account.
- Restore or delete the 100-home retrofit consistently across the document. Currently, the 100-home retrofit appears in some sections but has been dropped in others. If the proponents choose to delete it, beneficiaries, gender, safeguards and adaptation logic should be revised accordingly.
- Use one set of output targets throughout the proposal. Currently, there are target inconsistencies across several outputs, including drainage length, e-motos, BRT/BRT-ready corridors, wetlands, and land indicators.
- Map mitigation and adaptation outcomes to specific NDC and NAP commitments. Specifically, proponents can add a table linking each project outcome to relevant NDC or NAP targets.

- Revise the PCGF description to explain the capital model. Clearly state who provides first-loss capital, senior guarantee coverage, what portion is grant-funded technical assistance, what portion is risk capital, and what portion is expected private lending. Also define guarantee coverage, expected loss, pricing, claim process, recoveries, lender risk retention, eligibility rules, portfolio limits and governance arrangements.
- Clarify the leverage figures and remove contradictory finance claims. Specifically, the proposal should explain whether the US\$23 million and US\$ 37 million figures refer to confirmed co-finance, expected lending, guarantee-backed lending, private investment mobilised, or aspirational leverage. Currently, it is not clear whether the project has committed capital or only an expected pipeline.
- Explain how moto-taxi drivers that do not have formal employment, collateral or credit histories become eligible borrowers or lessees, including whether cooperatives, fleet aggregators, unions, leasing companies or leasing intermediaries are needed? (These issues are included in a [World Bank report](#) on motorcycle taxis in SSA).
- Map the project against the Greater Lomé SUMP and SDAU Master Plan. The review of prior investments omits SYSTRA's Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan (SUMP) for Greater Lomé and the near-finalised SDAU Master Plan, both of which are directly relevant to the proposed BRT corridors, NMT design, SOTRAL/operator reform, and institutional arrangements. The proponents should explain what these instruments already cover and what incremental activities this project finances. In addition, a matrix that shows existing initiatives, financed activities, geographic overlaps, project component affected, incremental GEF financing, remaining gaps, and duplication risks would be helpful
- Correct internal inconsistency in the GHG data. Currently, the proposal states that transport accounts for approximately 32% of national energy-related emissions in one section and just over 50% in another. STAP recommends that proponents use one figure, cite the source, explain the calculation boundary, and update the GHG mitigation estimate accordingly.
- Revise the ToC to include critical assumptions and monitoring triggers. Specifically, explicitly identify assumptions on bank lending, PCGF uptake, informal-driver eligibility, e-moto adoption, ministerial coordination, code enforcement, drainage maintenance, private-sector participation and women/youth enterprise pipelines and scaling. These assumptions should be reflected in the risk table, with indicators, triggers, thresholds, responsible parties and corrective actions.
- Correct the core-indicator classification and energy units. Transport and building mitigation should be linked to the appropriate core indicator from the current category, where it is reported under AFOLU. Verify whether the stated 15000 MWh energy saving has been correctly entered as 15,000 MJ in indicator 6.3. If so, please remember to correct as MWh are not equivalent to MJ.
- Add a circularity plan for e-mobility and construction works. Principles of circularity need to be considered given the scale of the e-moto swap-out scheme, the end-of-life management of PCGF-financed lithium-ion battery fleets, and the construction waste streams arising from physical works. Proponents should add a circularity plan which should include end-of-life recycling responsibilities, procurement requirements, take-back obligations, budgeted implementation arrangements etc. See the STAP advisory document on [how to design circular economy projects](#).