

Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in Burundi

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10278

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in Burundi

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/8/2022

Review completed by PM

1/11/2023

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes, the project remains aligned with the GEF CCM focal area elements as presented in the concept note (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10114_PFD_Electric_Mobility_Annex_ChildProjects.pdf)

Agency Response

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 EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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

EBF 4/20/2023:

1. We take note of the updated co-finance letter from the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines. The translation to English of this letter has been updated to the documents section. Cleared.
2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

EBF 03/17/2023:

We note the update in the co-finance table and the inclusion of the English translations of the co-finance letters in the document section of the project.

Please address the following comments regarding the co-finance letter from the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines:

1. Please clarify what is the actual co-financing contribution from the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines, since it is not clear. The letter mentions that \$4.15 million worth of electricity that will be paid by the users, so it is unclear what is the actual contribution from the Government.
2. The letter mentions that the charging stations will be installed near the electricity grid to avoid additional costs related to transport and/or distribution of electricity. Please clarify how this is addressed in the project design and if this poses the risk of the stations not being used because they are installed far from where they are needed.
3. There are a number of power plants which are listed as new generation capacity. Please clarify if these are renewable-powered or fossil-based power plants.

EBF 01/18/2023: We welcome the co-finance contributions described in section C from the Ministry of Trade, Transport, Industry and Tourism; Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock; and the World Bank. They account for a co-finance ratio of 8.8 compared to the total project cost. Kindly upload the respective co-finance letters (a scanned copy of the original letter as well as English translated version) using the proper format to consider the co-finance contributions.

Agency Response

UNEP 17 April 2023:

1. Due to some misformulations in the previous co-finance letter, the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines has issued an updated co-finance letter, which is being included in this new submission.

The co-finance contribution of the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines to the project actually corresponds to investments into hydropower plants projects over the 4 years of the GEF project implementation. This increase in the share of renewable energy in the country's mix will contribute to the scale up of Burundi's e-mobility market. The co-finance amount corresponding to these investments is valued at approximately 4 million US dollars. Indeed, the Ministry is engaged in public investments for the construction and commissioning of four (4) national and regional hydro-power projects (RUSUMO Falls of 80MW with 26MW for Burundi, KABU 16 (20MW), JJI-MULEMBWE (49MW), RUZIZI III of 206 MW with 68 MW for Burundi), corresponding to a total investment of USD 1,417 million, out of which USD 685 million for Burundi only. These hydroelectric projects will increase the production of renewable energy in Burundi and will be sufficient to supply RE power the needs induced by GEF electric mobility, with an estimated consumption of 5.08 GWh by the GEF project towards its completion in year 2027 (i.e. 0.59% of the minimum production capacity of the four new public investment hydroelectric projects mentioned above), as well as its scaling up for the deployment of electric mobility in the country beyond the life of the project. The amount of co-financing for the GEF project can be estimated at a minimum of 0.59% of the national investment associated with these four projects, i.e. approximately 4 million US dollars.

2. This was again an erroneous statement in the previous co-finance letter of the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines, and has now been removed from the new letter.

As described in the text for Component 2 in the CEO endorsement document, the charging schemes for the EVs will be determined during the feasibility study, which will take into account the constraints associated with electrical grid access. Moreover, it is envisaged that the charging modalities will likely be either overnight charging in the operator's depot, or charging through a battery swapping system which does not entail risks associated with grid access. It is also explained in the CEO endorsement document that the project could optionally install charging infrastructure along the pilot corridor (if deemed relevant by the feasibility study), and if this is the case the charging sites would be determined in coordination with the WB-funded Transport Resilience Project, to ensure the WB project makes the necessary provisions for the same in its design and construction of infrastructure improvements along the RN-3 corridor.

3. The power plants listed as new / future generation capacity are indeed renewable based facilities (hydropower).

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The co-finance table has been updated in line with latest contributions from the Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines and from UNEP. The respective co-finance letters were uploaded on the GEF Portal, along with a English translation in Word format, whenever applicable.

It is noteworthy to mention that the World Bank was not able to provide a signed version of the co-finance letter for the GEF project, although it will seek to ensure synergies between its Transport Resilience Project in Burundi (US\$ 120 million) and the GEF funded e-mobility project. Instead of a co-finance letter from the World Bank, a signed letter of support was received from the Ministry of Trade, Transport, Industry and Tourism (include in Annex O-2 of the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document, and also uploaded directly on the GEF Portal), outlining the areas of synergies between the 2 projects. It is important to highlight that the Ministry of Trade, Transport, Industry and Tourism is one of the 2 main

executing entities of the Work Bank funded ?Transport Resilience Project in Burundi? project, so it will have a central role in ensuring the synergies between both initiatives.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

BF 03/17/2023: Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: We note the correspondence included in the documents section that justifies and provides the clearance by the GEF Sec of the project for the exceptional execution arrangements of \$22,000 by UNEP to support the project.

Please address the following comment:

1. On the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC should be decreased, and the co-financing contribution to PMC should be increased to reach a similar level. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10% for a co-financing of \$6,552,200, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$655,220 instead of \$278,500 (which is 4.2%). Please amend by increasing the co-financing portion and/or reducing the GEF portion.

	Sub Total (\$)	705,171.00	6,552,200.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	70,517.00	278,500.00
	Sub Total(\$)	70,517.00	278,500.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	775,688.00	6,830,700.00

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The project's overall co-finance has been adjusted (see response to previous comment) and now reaches a total amount of US\$ 4,580,700, out of which 428,500 is allocated to PMC (?10% of the total).

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

EBF 03/17/2023: We take note of the updated figures. According to Annex C, \$47,997.94 have been spent to date and \$2,000.00 have been committed. Based on these figures, there is an unspent amount of \$2.06 of the PPG.

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes, the PPG utilization status is indicated. According to Annex C, \$44,388.23 have been spent to date and the remaining \$5,611.77 are committed, for a total of \$50,000. It is also noted that "if at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies (UNEP) can continue to undertake exclusively preparation activities up to one year of CEO Endorsement/approval date. No later than one year from CEO endorsement/approval date. Agencies should report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report."

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The status of use of PPG funds has been updated in Annex C.

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

EBF 03/17/2023: Noted. Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. We note that there is a reduction in the direct GHG emissions and an increase in the indirect GHG emissions mitigated by the project compared to the concept note. Please provide an explanation in the text below the Core Indicators section why these calculations changed based on Annex M.

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The original concept note included the demonstration of electric LDVs (as taxis) and motorcycles. At the detailed project development stage, the demonstration of electric LDVs was found as unfeasible, due to the lack of financial capacity of private taxi owners, and the project focused on electric 3W taxis instead. This explains the reduction in direct GHG emission savings.

The project approach puts more effort in the improvement of public transport operations, including the complementarity of electric 3Ws with bus services. Based on the demonstration's results, the project strategy strongly supports replication in all the key vehicle segments, and especially in public transport minibuses and buses. Such electrification of transport results in higher indirect GHG emission savings.

Explanatory text on this matter was added at the section 1a. Changes in project design? and at the end of the Core Indicators annex (see PDF file of the CEO Endorsement Document).

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes, the global environmental problems, including the root causes and barriers are well described and addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 03/17/2023: Noted. Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Clarify if the Rusomo Falls powerplant did go-online by the end of 2022, as described in the baseline section.

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The latest update is that construction works had reached 98.5% in January 2023. Therefore, this baseline statement has been updated, reflecting that it is expected to be commissioned in the 2nd or 3rd quarter of year 2023.

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

EBF 03/17/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. Cleared.
4. Thank you for the explanation. Cleared.
5. Thank you for the explanation. Cleared.
6. Cleared.
7. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
8. Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Please clarify what is meant by "section 3" as it is referred to several times across the document.
2. We welcome the development of a national gender-sensitive electric mobility strategy under Output 1.2. However, the current description doesn't provide details on how this strategy will address the gender component. Please explain.
3. Regarding deliverable 1.2.2, related to the national charging network scheme. Considering the limited access to electricity in Burundi, the limited reliability of the electricity grid and the increasing penetration of fossil-based gensets, it would be relevant to explain how this national charging network scheme will avoid (1) increasing the need for fossil fuels and (2) aim to become a resource rather than a burden to the electricity grid.
4. As part of Output 1.3, two initial capacity building training workshops are foreseen, each one with 10 participants. Please provide a short explanation why these

workshops are meant for only 10 participants? Will these workshops take place virtually or face-to-face?

5. We note that you have identified electric 3W manufacturers and technology providers active in the East African markets. Have you engaged with these stakeholders to confirm their interest to enter into to the Burundian market or participate in the bidding process under Output 2.2? Please provide a brief explanation in this regard as part of Component 2.
6. Clarify what "CBD" stands for the first time it is mentioned in the text. For example, it is referred in the following sentence "Other options can include the services of e-3W taxis within CBD". Does this refer to the ban implemented in February 2022 preventing the access to the city center to 2Ws and 3Ws? If so, is it envisioned to lift this ban to electric 3W taxis? Please also clarify.
7. We encourage you to include gender considerations as part of the pre-feasibility and feasibility studies under Output 2.1. For example, the project could inquire how can electric vehicles make women's rides safer or more comfortable.
8. Regarding the demonstration of the electric 3Ws under Output 2.2, (1) include a brief explanation of the exit strategy for the electric vehicles after the demonstration, (2) specify if an insurance will be considered; if so, who will be responsible for paying it, (3) specify if the data collected as part of the MRV system under Output 2.2 will be publicly available to other stakeholders or if it will be restricted to certain stakeholders.

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

1. This refers to Part II section 3 (Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment). To avoid confusion, reference is made to the ?Gender Equality Section? now.
2. The gender component is embedded within the three stages of the preparation of the strategy (analysis of the road fleet characteristics and use, future scenarios for electrification and opportunities for socio-economic development), as well as through the participatory process to elaborate the strategy. The output 1.2 description has been revised to state this more clearly.
3. As stated in the output 1.2 description, the approach is to accommodate the expansion of the charging network to the deployment of renewable electricity generation in the country, in accordance with the ambitious electrification projects in the country (refer to the different renewable power production projects listed in the ?Baseline scenario? section). In this instance, Output 4.3 will explore the issue of integration of EV charging and renewables at the end of the project, to take stock of the lessons learnt and provide recommendations. Additional text has been added to Output 1.2 description to clarify these points.
4. The limited number of participants will allow closer and focused interaction as well as better tailored training dynamics. It is also adequate to attract senior officers with a high decisional level in the public and private sectors and to increase their interaction with the project; Finally, it is also consistent with the dimension of Burundi?s government and economy. This is now explained in Output 1.3 description.

5. UNEP has engaged with various e-3W manufacturers and charging / battery swapping providers, both African based and abroad. A few e-3W providers are interested in supplying e-3Ws to East Africa, including Burundi, at discounted cost and with necessary technical support and training (i.e. Piaggio and Mahindra). Several discussions with company staff in both India and Kenya have been held and the companies have confirmed their interest to engage in demonstration projects once these projects are ready to go. This has been further elaborated under the introductory paragraph of Component 2. It also is noteworthy to mention that energy providers / battery swappers such as Sun Mobility are equally interested in expanding to East Africa and working together with local and international e-2&3W brands on provision of swapping technology in Africa. UNEP, through the e-2&3W Working Group of the GEF-7 Global E-mobility Project is also in exchange with a large number of manufacturers and assemblers on the continent, now running an estimated more than 3,000 e-2&3Ws (estimates based on AEMDA, <https://aemda.org/knowledge-hub/>) all over Sub Saharan Africa. These include companies such as Ampersand (<https://www.ampersand.solar/>), ROAM (<https://www.roam-electric.com/>), Fika (<https://fikamobility.com/>), STIMA Boda (<https://stimaboda.com/>), Bodawerk (<https://bodawerk.com/>), ZEMBO (<https://www.zem.bo/>), MotoRhino (<https://motorhino.dk/>), ARCrider (<https://shop.arcriderglobal.com/>) ? just to name a few. All of these companies are highly interested in participating in piloting action part of the GEF e-mobility projects, including the project in Burundi.

6. CBD = Central Business District. Now clarified at its first appearance in the document and included in the list of acronyms (Annex Q). Yes, the sentence refers to the ban implemented in February 2022 preventing the access to the city center to 2Ws and 3Ws. Although at this time the Government has no plans to lift this ban to electric 3W taxis (and it was considered premature to discuss this during the project design stage), this is an option for the project to explore during implementation, to grant for example an exceptional clearance to electric 2W and 3W to access the city center, as a means to incentives/encourage the use of the vehicles.

7. There was already a sentence at the end of the second paragraph of output 2.1 stating that ?the mobility needs of women (see Gender Equality Section) will also be considered for the selection of vehicles and the design of services for the demonstration?. The sentence has been moved to the top of the output description and has been expanded, to make it clear that it refers to the prefeasibility and feasibility studies.

8. One paragraph has been added briefly explaining the exit strategy for the electric vehicles after the demonstration (they remain the property of the beneficiaries; they should be interested in keeping operations, are operating costs are lower than for ICE vehicles, but the MRV report will provide alternatives for operation in case the lines operated in the demonstration prove not to be commercially viable. Beneficiaries will need to provide proof of insurance as well as any other legal obligations; this is now explicitly stated; as vehicle owners, they will have to pay it. It is now clarified that the data collected as part of the MRV system 2 will be publicly available to other stakeholders.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes, this is well aligned with the GEF CCM focal area, especially regarding Objective 1, and entry point 2: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for electric drive technology and electric mobility (CCM-1-2).

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes, a map and geo-referenced information is 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

EBF 03/17/2023: Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Table 20 cannot be read, please update it again with a better resolution.

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The picture for table 20 has been uploaded with a higher resolution. We hope it is legible now.

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

EBF 03/17/2023: Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Similar to the comment made to the bidding process under Output 2.2, we note that you have identified electric 3W manufacturers and technology providers active in the East African markets. Did you engage with these stakeholders during project preparation?

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

1. Yes. Please refer to our earlier reply on this point.

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

EBF 03/17/2023: Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Considering that the project has aspects of improving women's participation (specified in project components and specific activities), please indicate "Yes" in the question that asks: "Improving women's participation and decision making" as described in the screen capture below:

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? ⓘ

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making ⓘ

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women ⓘ Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? ⓘ

Yes

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

Thank you for your comment. The box has been ticked on the GEF Portal.

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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

EBF 03/17/2023: Noted. Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Explain what "Miscellaneous M&E costs" entails. Please take into consideration that unspecified costs cannot be covered by GEF funds.

	gency			
Miscellaneous M&E costs	Executing Agency	US\$ 1,071		
Total		US\$ 47,671		

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

This has been replaced by other M&E (data and information collection, printing, etc.). It is a small budget to cover any additional needs to conduct M&E, such as collection of data or materials that require a payment or printing of materials necessary for information gathering (e.g. for interviews or surveys).

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

EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 03/17/2023: Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Regarding Annex E (Budget), clarify what "Office operations [Miscellaneous expenses] entail. Please take into consideration that unspecified costs cannot be covered by GEF funds.

Travel to provide international E-mobility Technical Support (UNEP SMU)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000		8,000		8,000	UNEP SMU
14. Office supplies						0	6,000	6,000	
Office supplies						0	6,000	6,000	MoTTIT
15. Other operating costs						1,071	1,071	8,000	9,071
Office operations (miscellaneous expenses)						0	8,000	8,000	MoTTIT
Other M&E costs						1,071	1,071	1,071	MoTTIT
Grand Total	154,720	357,300	71,800	73,680	47,671	705,171	70,517	775,688	

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

This refers to other PMU operating costs such as phone and internet data bills, printing, etc. The description of the budget line has been revised to better reflect this.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 03/17/2023: Cleared.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the following comment:

1. Regarding the end-target 1.2, the current mid-term target aims a "gender analysis and action plan for the strategy". Please clarify if this mid-term target aims for the gender analysis and action plan for the strategy to be implemented or adopted.

Agency Response

UNEP 06 March 2023:

The target is to get the gender analysis and action plan completed and subsequently endorsed by the Project Steering Committee by month 18 as an intermediate step within the preparation of the first draft of the national e-mobility strategy. This is now clarified in the project's logframe and in the narrative under output 1.2, in the 'Alternative scenario' section.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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 EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 01/18/2023: Yes.

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

EBF 04/20/2023: The PM recommends the clearance for CEO Endorsement.

EBF 03/17/2023: Please address the comments related to the co-financing section.

EBF 01/18/2023: Please address the comments above.

** Please highlight in green 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	1/18/2023	3/6/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2023	4/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations