Supporting the Shift to Electric Mobility in Zimbabwe

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11083
Countries

Zimbabwe
Project Name

Supporting the Shift to Electric Mobility in Zimbabwe
Agencies

UNEP
Date received by PM

8/28/2024
Review completed by PM

10/11/2024
Program Manager

Remy Ruat
Focal Area

Climate Change
Project Type

MSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes, table is correctly filled including executing entity consistent with project description.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes, Rio marker of 2 for CCM is selected consistently with project objective and logframe, other markers not applicable.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

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

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Cleared, thank you for the synthesis.

2. Cleared.

RR (9/12/2024):

Project summary is of good quality, describing the problem and how the child project attempts to address it in line with the approach of the parent program.

1. With 500 words it remains double the expected length and for increased clarity could be brought closer to the ideal length by deleting some baseline information that is already provided in more details in the project rationale (for example the last sentence of the first paragraph conveys a similar message as the one before and could go).

2. Thank you for including in the summary the numbers corresponding to the mentionned expected direct and indirect impact.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

Note: all edits performed in the CEO Endorsement Document have been highlighted in blue, for the sake of clarity.

1. The project summary length has now been reduced to less than 250 words, as requested by the reviewer.

2. The direct and indirect GHG emission reduction figures have now been included in the Summary section.

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. PM takes note that work on the roadmap update and investment plan for scale up will indeed integrate consideration on EV batteries end-of-life - this was the main purpose of the comment and it is addressed. Thank you.

2. Noted

3. Noted

RR (9/12/2024):

Project objective is adequate and consistent with underlying project logframe.

1. The theory of change is relatively aligned with the parent program, with the exception of the fourth component, which focuses explicitly on the issue of environmental sustainability of EVs including end-of life. While this consideration is welcome and also aligned with the approach of the parent program in terms of content, the framing as a separate component raises the question of whether this consideration is integrated in the considerations of the national roadmap and upscaling dealt with by other components, or as an ad hoc subject (the parent program considers this issue in a systemic way by including it within the other components). Could you please consider this and clarify as appropriate?

2. GEF project financing and co-financing contributions are close to proportional (1% difference), PMC is slightly above 5%, but this is an MSP so in line with guidelines. No further comment, pending on confirmation of co-financing - please see comments under the co-financing section.

3. Gender (1&2), KM(1) and M&E(separate) included withing project components. For KM, there is a lesser focus on it as compared to the parent program due to the focus on environmental sustainability of the last component. Clarification would be useful here.

Agency Response

?

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Please note that this four-fold component structure (+ 1 component for M&E and PMC) is the way the logical framework has been structured for all GEF-8 e-mobility country projects in Africa / Europe, and it is also aligned with the way the GEF-7 e-mobility country projects had been structured.
We also wish to clarify that the work on the National E-mobility Policy Roadmap update (output 1.2) and the investment plan for scale up (output 3.5) will indeed integrate consideration on EV batteries end-of-life. This has been further elaborated in the narrative descriptions of outputs 1.2 and 3.5, in section B.3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

2. Noted. See our responses to the questions on co-finance further below.

3. Knowledge management is fully covered through output 1.3 of the project (?*A national and public online knowledge management repository on e-mobility is created, operationalized and maintained*?), as part of component 1 of the Zimbabwe e-mobility project, through the development of a Knowledge Management Plan (deliverable 1.3.2), the establishment of an online knowledge management repository (deliverable 1.3.3) and annual reporting on knowledge management / products (deliverable 1.3.5). This is the same approach that was applied on other GEF-8 e-mobility country projects. While the knowledge management output 1.3 is hosted under component 1 (i.e. the ?institutionalization? component of the project), it will consolidate knowledge from all the other components (2, 3 and 4) of the project. This has been further clarified in the narrative of output 1.3, in section B.3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

4. Project Outline

A. Project 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 project design?

b) Have 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 project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

The project rationale is very well written. Thank you for the provided baseline details. Please see comments on the quantitative end in the core-indicator section of this review sheet.

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical

assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?
f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Please note that a GEF TOC diagram usually includes a summary of corresponding problems/barriers/root causes to visualize correspondance between the causal pathways towards ultimate impact and the underlying problem they seek to address. Given the size of the TOC diagram in this case, as noted below, this is fine, but please take note for future reference.

2. Noted. The issue to be clarified was mostly the mainstreaming of environmental sustainability in project design, not the number of components. This is cleared.

3. Thank you for the clarification. Useful to report on this issue at MTR stage as it seems to be a critical assumption of the success of the project.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. The TOC includes a few repetitions in the first column. It is also split from the problem diagram which is not a recommended practice in GEF templates (but understandable in this specific case given readability issues).

2. Please see comments on the logframe above regarding consistency with program TOC.

3. 2 buses seems like a very low amount of vehicles to structure a fleet sufficient to sustain a pilot with any replication value - could you please clarify how this is articulated with the fleet to be procured through co-financing (per shared co-financing letters)? Could you also confirm that the procurement through GEF financing will be competitively performed? Finally, an assessment of the cost-efficiency of going through an entire procurement process for only 2 vehicles, would be welcome.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. The repetition in the TOC has been corrected. Please note that the Problem Tree is presented in section A.3 on ?Barriers? while the TOC is presented in section B.2. This is also the way these have been presented in the other GEF-8 project document prepared by UNEP.

2. Please refer to our earlier responses on the same. This four-fold component structure (+ 1 component for M&E and PMC) is the way the logical framework has been structured for all GEF-8 e-mobility country projects in Africa / Europe

3. We have included additional text to clarify this in the introduction of Component 2, in section B.3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document:
?*Public operators like ZUPCO have already initiated plans to incorporate e-buses into their fleets in the near future, with tenders being floated and results likely to materialize during the life of the GEF project. The pilot deployment of two e-buses under this GEF project is a crucial step in providing operators such as ZUPCO with firsthand experience and reducing the risks associated with future EV investments. Although the limited GEF project?s budget allows for only two (2) e-buses, this contribution remains significant as operators are already preparing for a broader transition to EVs. By leveraging existing efforts from public operators, the project will support this transition. Additionally, based on the outcomes of this pilot, stakeholders are expected to proceed with further fleet procurement, as indicated in the co-financing letters*.?

Competitive procurement process: we can indeed confirm that the procurement of the 2 e-buses supported by the GEF project will follow a competitive process. This has been clarified in the narrative of output 2.4, in section B.3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

Cost effectiveness: as mentioned, public operators already have plans to initiate the EV transition process and planning, which will be effectively utilized during the procurement of the two (2) e-buses

for this project. The prior activities and some of the groundwork by the operators such as their experience in e-buses, tender preparation, international visits to meet different e-bus OEMs, etc. will be beneficial in facilitating the procurement, ensuring an optimized and streamlined process.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).
d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

The Project sets aside budget for participation in global program platform knowledge sharing activities. It is consistent with the overall ambition of the program in its coordination and collaboration framework. It describes coordination with other initiatives directly linked to project logframe and co-financing.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators
a) 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)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?
b) Are the project?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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/29/2024):

1. Thank you for the revision. Data on the core indicator table is consistent.

2. Thank you for the useful details. This is a thorough justification.

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Thank you for the clarification. The issue is the same with the ITDP transporation manual, which is now obsolete is not recommended to be used for GEF projects. This manual, like the energy efficiency manual, was developed at a time when the GEF was one of the only environmental financiers in the financial architecture, and with a much higher share of tangible investment in overall project budget, and where it was more suitable to make assumptions on high causality of GEF interventions. This is not the case anymore on all of these levels, so that causality factors above 20% are very difficult to justify, even in a small market like Zimbabwe. This is a structural issue with the default factors of the e-mob tool that UNEP should consider addressing (just to be clear, this is an issue that goes beyond this specific project and would require attention at Agency-wide level) - would recommend for example using increments of 2% to 4% for each levels, not 20%, so that a maximum of 10% to 20% of causality may be reached. Having the option to select 100% causality in this tool for example would be hardly justifiable by any project in any country today - and it is unlikely that any other financier would dare venture into claiming such impact.

Taking a step back and looking at the numbers - this project is investing in two e-buses (this is the proposed physical investment for 2 M$, along with TA). The direct impact estimated from this is 1,796 tCo2e. Going from there to secondary direct emission reductions from replications reaching 828,438 tCo2e entails a multiplication by 461, meaning agency assumes that the full, direct result of investing in two buses, is that 461 buses will follow, the entire impact of which would be attributed to GEF investment. This is not reasonable. It would be if those follow up investments were entirely due to GEF financing following a revolving fund approach, or if we could tell for sure that the only reasons such investments are made in the short term are because of the GEF project, but such a radical jump is just not acceptable per GEF standards. If such practice was adopted in other GEF e-mobility projects, then this needs to change as well, to only account for what can reasonably be expected to be attributed to GEF financing.

Moving on to the policy effect - the baseline scenario assumes 0% electric vehicles sales, when throughout the project document and review sheet agency confirmed that other e-buses pilots are ongoing and investments in e-buses planned - and a roadmap already in place at national level as well (figure 5 of the CEO ER and its short term and medium term sales targets is one example among many of this inconsistency); so that it seems inconsistent to assume that without the project none of that potential will be realized. This should be adjusted as well. The alternative scenario is fine.

In summary, the total GHG emission reductions are currently overestimated given the amounts invested and the nature of the intervention. To land on a more conservative number, please:

(i) adjust the baseline scenario to reflect ongoing efforts

(ii) adjust the causality factor applied to both secondary direct and indirect effect, to be more realistic

2. Noted - please also clarify how the emission factor was derived for electric vehicles, and whether and how it accounts for the prospective evolution of the grid factor.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. The expected contributions to GHG emission reductions are reasonable - with a question mark on the causality factor which seems high, as it is based similar levels as those used in the GEF energy efficiency manual, which is based on a different market segment for different technologies and for which expectations of GEF role in market penetration were more suited to high coefficients. In general we would not expect the levels of the GEF energy efficiency calculator (which is 15 years old) to be transposable in other sectors and intervention modalities like was proposed here by the agency. For the case of this project which is for a different sector, it would be important to root the choice of the causality factor in an understanding of the likely influence and role of this specific GEF project over the entire market potential, given other initiatives on the matter (baseline points to pre-existence of pilots, and sustainability hinges on substantial co-financing yet to materialize) and agency knowledge of the local context and sectoral trends.

2. As a good practice to faciltiate the review, could you please share the calculation excel sheet directly that was used to make this calculation (the annex provided in the prodoc provides only the end results) (assuming this was based on the UNEP e-mob calculator)? This would be helpful in particular to better understand the emission factors used among others. Please also, as noted above, make sure to justify the choices of parameters made in the calculation sheet (in particular on market penetration, causality, grid factors).

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 28/10/2024

Note to reviewer: all new edits performed in the CEO Endorsement Document following this 2nd round of comments have been highlighted in yellow, for the sake of clarity.

1. Thank you for your comments. We have adjusted the causality factor to 20% and have revised the benchmark scenario for buses and LDVs, anticipating a gradual uptake of EVs in the baseline scenario and assuming a more significant penetration in the e-mobility scenario. The updated calculation sheets have been uploaded in the ?Documents? section of the GEF Portal, in a zip file.

2. GHG emission of electric LDVs are based on: (1) the use of average tested fuel efficiency of 18 kWh/km; (2) adjustment of tested fuel efficiency with a gap factor of 20% to reflect real world fuel efficiency; (3) multiplication with annual distance driven of an average of 15,000km per year; and (4) Multiplication with a grid emission factor which evolves over time from 0.7 kg CO_2/kWh in 2020 to about 0.42kg CO_2/kWh in 2030. This evolution anticipates a 40% reduction of carbon intensity of the grid until 2030. This is in-line with: (1) stated targets to add 2,100 MW or 26.5% overall power supply of renewable power (excluding large hydro) by 2030; and (2) the target to put in operation Batoka Gorge hydropower plant before 2030, which will add 2,400MW (jointly Zambia and Zimbabwe) to the actual overall capacity of 2,300MW (Zimbabwe 2023, 55% thermal and 45% hydro).

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. The applied causality factor is taken from the ?Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of Global Environment Facility Transportation Projects? (https://itdp.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/GEF_CalculatingGHGbenefits_webCD.pdf), which is part of the TEEMP model package developed by ITDP for GEF Transportation Projects. As such, the different causality factors seem to be proposed for application with transport projects. For Zimbabwe, a causality factor of 40% (modest impact) has been chosen based on: 1.) the ambition of the project to put in place a national e-mobility policy framework including for light duty vehicles and buses ? which once in place will have indeed significant impact on the take-up of e-mobility in the country; and 2.) Compared to other e-mobility markets in East and West Africa, Southern African countries such as Zimbabwe are somewhat lacking behind ? which is why the impact of the GEF-8 E-Mobility is evaluated at a higher impact (40%) compared to many other countries with somewhat more developed e-mobility initiatives.

2. The GHG calculation worksheets have now been uploaded in the ?Documents? section of the GEF Portal, in a zip file. Note that in the calculation worksheet, the applied scenarios for EV sales are ambitious, with up to 20% of all new bus sales being electric buses (new e-buses), and 6% of all LDVs registered for the first time being EVs (mostly used imported EVs) by 2030. Proposing a high level of ambition already in the project document will help formulating ambitious targets for the development of strategies and roadmaps

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/29/2024):

1. Cleared.

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Thank you for the response, this makes sense. It would be useful to reflect your clarification below directly in the risk table, which currently only includes one line on difficult access to financial

resources and is therefore still unclear - the elements you provided below would address this - and would also further reinforce the rationale for this project.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. The risk assessment is well articulated, with corresponding mitigation measures. environmental risk is assessed as moderate, consistently with the ESS risk rating further below. Given the extent of mitigation measures, it is suprising to see a residual risk as substantial for the financing/business model category of risk, especially since this is the core focus of project components. Please clarify why the residual risk is expected to be so high in spite of all this focus?

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 28/10/2024

1. The clarifications have been incorporated in the risk table, in the ?financial / business model? category.

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Zimbabwe faces significant challenges in EV financing due to the early stage of EV adoption and the lack of economies of scale in the market. Financiers remain hesitant to invest in the sector, as they are not yet confident about the growth prospects and market maturity. Additionally, the absence of robust government policies or a strong push towards e-mobility further complicates the landscape, making it difficult for investors to gauge long-term viability. Public transport operators are expressing interest in introducing EVs to their fleets, recognizing the environmental and operational benefits. However, financing issues, driven by these uncertainties, are delaying the transition, leaving operators unable to move forward with their plans. For all of these reasons, we believe it is important to mark this risk category as Substantial at the project design stage. This is also a way to ensure that the project management unit pays close attention to this risk category during project implementation, and prepares appropriate mitigation measures to contain the risk.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes, alignment with focal area strategy and with program objectives, pending addressing slight inconsistency noted on logframe structure vis-a-vis parent program noted above.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

Refer to our response above on the Zimbabwe country project?s logframe structure vis a vis the global program.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Thank you for the useful addition - cleared.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. Yes, although the project rationale duly notes that there is an inconsistency with the NDC which is consubstantial to the fact that the revised NDC (as well as other climate strategies and policies) currently lacks emphasis on electrification in the transport sector. Is there an aim through this project to inform further iterations to better align climate and energy policies with the national e-mobility strategy? This seems important to ensure long term sustainability of project outcomes.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Zimbabwe?s last NDC was approved in 2021, with the next one expected in 2025, coinciding with the start of this GEF project?s implementation. Therefore, the results / outcomes of this GEF project would likely inform the following iteration of NDC updating, i.e. NDC 2030. A sentence has been added in the narrative description of Output 1.2 to emphasize this, in section B.3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

1. The filling of the policy requirement sections related to gender is somewhat surprising. The project summary and rationale highlighted that per gender action plan prepared, issues with women's access to funding, resources and services were prominent for this country sector and project - however, the corresponding items are not ticked in the policy requirements section. This seems to be inconsistent with the content of the gender action plan which foresees actions on this topic as part of component 2.

2. The same goes for role of CSOs, which seems inconsistent with the content of the Stakeholder engagement plan.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Thank you for your comment. It is true the project will also generate socio-economic benefits for women. The corresponding box has now been ticked in section D1 of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

2. Thanks for the inputs. The CSO box under section D.2 has been ticked now, and a 1-paragraph writeup has been added in section D.2 of the revised PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Request Document (uploaded in the ?Documents? section of the GEF Portal) to explain how they can help in the project. Not that this paragraph could not be added to the GEF Portal itself, since there is no field available to add such text.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Cleared

2. Please note per GEF guidelines actions detailed in the gender action plan, similarly to other key standards, should be reflected throughout project design and not restricted to the related annex. This being said, the comments have been adequately addressed in the results framework, this is cleared.

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes, included in Prodoc Annex K.

1. See comments under the policy requirement section.1.

2. Please also ensure that the RF includes gender-sensitive indicators that capture the indicated gender-responsive measures in the project components (e.g., number of gender-responsive plans, number of women accessing financial instruments, number of women trained in new skills/technologies, number of women in new jobs, number of women and women?s organizations involved in decision making processes). On M&E, please include a reference to capturing gender-specific results and reporting on those.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Comment on policy requirements addressed ? see our response above.

2. All project gender-responsive indicators and targets are already detailed in the Gender Action Plan (Annex K) of the CEO Endorsement Request document, in line with the gender responsive activities under the different project components.
Please note that the quantitative indicators gaging female beneficiaries / representation are measured in ratio (%) of women rather than absolute number of women, to set an equality / parity target for the project in terms of female representation in governing bodies / decision-making, in trainings / capacity building and in consultation workshops.
The different gender-responsive plans are also already captured in the Gender Action Plan, such as the updated National E-mobility Policy Roadmap (output 1.2), the national communication plan (output 1.4) and the e-bus pilot implementation plan (output 2.2). We have also added a gender indicator / target under component 3 regarding the gender-responsive measures to be considered in the investment plan developed under output 3.5.
Finally, please note that the project outputs? will not be directly resulting in the creation of new jobs (for men or for women) in the EV sectors, so the project cannot set a target for this. Rather this is an indirect effect of the project?s outcomes, which will most likely materialize after the end of the project?s lifetime.
On M&E, refer to the description of Component 5 in section B3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document, which has a dedicated deliverable 5.1.4 to monitor the implementation of the Gender Action Plan twice a year and capture gender-specific results.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

1. Yes, included in Prodoc Annex L. See comments under the policy requirement section.1.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Refer to our earlier response to the comment on policy requirements relating to stakeholder engagement (i.e. role of CSOs).

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. As noted below, no revision was needed - this is noted for institutional record.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. There is a one dollar difference between the OFP LOE and the source of funds table under the CCM STAR allocation line (one dollar smaller on the portal - this probably does not warrant a revision)

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. We understand that this difference is because of a rounding issue due to the way the GEF Portal allocates the resources. Please note that the ?Source of Funds? table in the GEF Portal is automatically populated by the system ? we cannot change this from our end.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/29/2024):

1. Thank you - this was exactly the type of details expected and it clarifies one important point which was not clear before : this is not an infrastructure investment (with 1M$, it would have been a drop in the ocean in view of renewable capacity costs), but is a public financing for planning purposes in connection with the project.

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Thank you for the details - which are a useful addition and should be kept - the comment was however of a different nature. The rationale for increasing renewables jointly with EV is understood - the GEF would not be financing a global e-mobility program otherwise. The issue here is to clarify why this investment is due and connected to the existence of the GEF project, at the operational level, not at the strategic, rationale level. Was the existence of the GEF financing for EVs a motive for the MEPD decision to invest in this specific RE facility ? Was this done based on an assessment of the how much increase in demand will be due to EV expansion and to be met with additional RE capacities? Would this investment have happened without the EV project? Would the EV project be any different if this investment was not accounted for as co-financing? Please thoroughly justify, from a financial perspective, or if no convincing supporting evidence can be provided, please simply remove - there is no need to lose more time in the review if this does not have any tangible impact on project implementation; instead, more useful to clarify in project design how at policy planning level the increase in power consumption from e-vehicles should inform investment priorities in renewables through inputs in energy master planning for example - because this is something that would be more within the remit of what this project can do to secure its long term impact sustainability in line with its theory of change.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. Please see comments below:

- MTID, MECW, MLGPWNH / ZUPCO, UN Habitat co-financing : cleared, thank you for the details provided, which justify well how these co-financing will support projet activities. No further comments on this.

- MEPD co-financing : for the investment mobilized section, 1M$ is estimated for investment in renewable energy infrastructures expected to support the growing consumption from EVs. But the project document highlights that EVs are not included in the the national energy/climate strategies. How is this investment in renewables connected to the project's investments in EVs? what is the link, concretely? If this cannot be established, would suggest to remove this part from the co-financing.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 28/10/2024

1. Thank you for your comments. The Ministry of Energy and Power Development (MEPD) co-financing is connected to this project on two levels.

At a more strategic and holistic level, the Zimbabwe project has the objective of accelerating the introduction of electric mobility in Zimbabwe with a focus on reducing GHG emissions, improving air quality and the environmentally sound management of EV waste. In accordance with the GEF definitions of co-financing (as per its co-financing policy and guidelines), the MEPD co-financing, including both in-kind technical assistance and public investments, supports the implementation of the GEF project and the achievements of its objective. As noted in the theory of change, figure 7 (and mentioned in the previous response), the expansion of electricity generation from renewables (RE) is a key driver for achieving the project?s objective of reducing GHG emissions. As the reviewer notes, without such the GEF would not finance EV projects.

More concretely, at the operational level the public investments in renewable energies will be directly informed by the implementation of the following GEF project outputs / deliverables, including:

- Output 3.3, deliverables 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.5. The public charging infrastructure needs assessment in Harare carried out under this output will contribute to informing the MEPD?s up-coming public investments into RE power production to support the country?s transition to e-mobility.
- Output 3.5, deliverables 3.5.1 and 3.5.4, related to the investment plan for upscaling of EVs and charging infrastructure in Zimbabwe. The investment plan will also include recommendations for the MEPD to inform public investments into RE power production, to contribute to the growing energy demand from transport.

While not attributed in the signed co-finance letter, the MEPD public investment will also be indirectly informed by the achievement of the following GEF project output / deliverable:

- Output 4.1, deliverable 4.1.2, related to the impact assessment report on EV charging load (both peak and units) on grid infrastructure and recommendations for future investments, including RE, grid upgrades and potential technological applications (e.g. smart charging, V2G, off-grid applications, etc.). The report will include recommendations for the development of electrical power production capacities (including RE), which will also inform the investment plan developed under output 3.5.

Consistent with the GEF policy definition of co-financing, we hope that the above clarifies how the MEPD co-financing is additional to GEF Project Financing, and supports the implementation of the GEF-financed project as well as the achievement of its objective.

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. MEPD co-financing: Renewable energy (RE) is key to scaling up the EV market and driving greater greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions in the transport sector. As EV adoption rises, the energy demand from charging infrastructure grows, and if this demand is met through RE sources such as solar, wind, or others, the environmental benefits of EVs are maximized. EVs powered by clean energy reduce reliance on fossil fuels, leading to even more reduction in GHG emissions from the transport sector. Scaling up RE ensures that EVs are truly zero-emission vehicles, cutting both direct emissions from vehicles and indirect emissions from electricity generation. This combination of RE and EV growth accelerates the transition to a low-carbon transport system, reinforcing climate goals and supporting long-term sustainability. Hence, there is a direct link of the proposed USD 1 million investment from MEPD towards the development of the sector and included in the co-financing letter.

Further elements of clarification on this matter have been added in the narrative description of output 3.3, in section B.3 of the CEO Endorsement Request document. This has also been made more explicit by including a new driver on ?expansion of electricity generation from renewables? in the Theory of Change diagram, in section B.2 of the CEO Endorsement Request document.

Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the 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 comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

1. There is a one dollar difference (1 more dollar on the letter compared to portal, on the CC Star allocation line). As this is a rounding issue, it does not warrant a resubmission.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. Noted ? thank you. Refer to our response above. No action required.

Annex C: Project Results Framework
8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?
b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)
c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?
d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?
e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/29/2024):

1. Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. The table for outcome level indicators is still out of margins - about 30% of the 5th column is out of margin - sorry for this but could you please reformat again. Thank you.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. The results framework table for outcome level indicators is out of margins starting with the 5th column - please reformat within the margin of the portal entry.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 28/10/2024

1. We have reformatted the table.

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. The project result framework table has been reformatted in the GEF portal.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates
8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

Yes.

Agency Response
Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating
8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Cleared

RR (9/12/2024):

risk rating is uploaded and filled out.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template
8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?
b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?
c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Cleared

2. Noted, cleared.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. The GEF budget template is missing the corresponding executing partner for each budget lines.

2. Also, PMC costs are charged to components (and to M&E) for the project technical coordinator, which is not in line with GEF guidelines.

Agency Response

UNEP response ? 10/10/2024

1. The GEF budget template now includes the Executing entity for each budget line.

2. The reason why the Project Technical Coordinator (PTC) is budgeted across project components and PMC is because he/she will have dual responsibilities, both managerial (his/her principal role, budgeted under PMC) and technical/substantive (budgeted across the different substantive components 1 to 5). The difference between the management activities and the technical activities are outlined in the TORs for the PTC, provided in Annex I of the CEO Endorsement Request document. This is compliant with GEF policy and consistent with the practice on past GEF projects.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A.

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared

RR (10/29/2024):

1. All comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for approval.

RR (10/10/2024):

1. Most comments have been addressed. Again, thank you for the very good quality and clarity of this project document. Remaining points relate to co-financing, core indicators, pending reformatting, risk table update. This should hopefully be the last round of review.

Thank you in this iteration for removing the blue highlights in the CEO Endorsement Request Portal view considering that this will be the final document circulated for Council review. For any final revisions, please highlight in the review sheet where they can be found in the project document.

RR (9/12/2024):

1. This project document is very well written - this is sufficiently rare to be noted, thank you for this contribution to a smooth review process. There are a few remaining items to address before it can be recommended for approval. Thank you for highlighting changes made in the revised submission, for ease of reference.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**9/12/2024**	**10/10/2024**
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/10/2024**	**10/28/2024**
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/29/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		