

Promoting Low-carbon Electric Public Bus Transport in Mauritius

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10372

Countries

Mauritius

Project Name

Promoting Low-carbon Electric Public Bus Transport in Mauritius

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

10/21/2021

Program Manager

Ming Yang

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF 7 CCM focal area strategy: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy

breakthroughs with electric drive technologies and electric mobility.

10/26/2021 MY:

Please address the following comments from the GEF PPO:

11/10/2021 MY:

The comments on 10/26/2021 have not been addressed.

These comments are shown below again. Please formally address them. For example, the "Notification for Major amendment" was uploaded to the Portal on November 4, 2021, but the action is not indicated or addressed in any responses of the Agency. Please formally address the following comments of the PPO one by one.

1. Project Expected Implementation Start date has already past ? please amend it.

As this is a UNDP project, it has to be circulated for 4-weeks prior to CEO Endorsement. Hence, there is a risk for this project not to be ready by December 19th, 2021, which is the deadline for this project to obtain the CEO Endorsement. Please consider to ask the OFP to submit the Request for Extension ? otherwise, the likelihood

for this project to be at risk of cancellation if not CEO Endorsed by December 19th is considerable.

2. CEO endorsement financing has increased by 73% in comparison with PIF stage financing. This must be processed as a major amendment with all the required steps. The Agency needs to fill out the Notification for Major amendment (we have seen a revised LoE which includes the requested increased funding). Only when the above steps are completed and processed, the project can be resubmitted.

PIF stage							
D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds							
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Mauritius	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	3,229,998	306,850	3,536,848
Total GEF Resources(\$)					3,229,998	306,850	3,536,848
CEO Endorsement stage							
D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds							
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	
UNDP	GET	Mauritius	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	5,600,607	532,057	6,132,664
Total Grant Resources(\$)					5,600,607	532,057	6,132,664
Change					2,370,609	225,207	2,595,816
					73%		

3. The M&E budget table under section 9 of the Portal entry shows a total budget of \$118,000 while the M&E column in the budget table under Annex E shows zero M&E budget ? please amend it.

- M&E budget table

Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget:		
This M&E plan and budget provides a breakdown of costs for M&E activities to be led by the Project Management Unit during project implementation. These costs are included in Component 5 of the Results Framework and TBWP. For ease of reporting M&E costs, please include all costs reported in the M&E plan under the one technical component. The oversight and participation of the UNDP Country Office Regional technical advisors/HQ Units are not included as these are covered by the GEF Fee.		
GEF M&E requirements	Indicative costs (US\$)	Time frame
Inception Workshop	10,000	Within 60 days of CEO endorsement of this project
Inception Report	None	Within 90 days of CEO endorsement of this project
M&E of GEF core indicators and project results framework	25,000	Annually and at mid-point and closure
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	None	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	None (covered under Project Management and other monitoring of indicators)	On-going
Supervision missions	None	Annually
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR)	10,000	Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE)	45,000	At least three months before operational closure
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses	115,000 (2.1% of GEF grant)	

- Budget table in Portal:

	at nodes 12, 13 and 13-2000										
Other Operating Costs	This line item includes costs for carrying out the NIM final audits each year budgeted at a total of USD 25,387 over 6 years of project implementation								25,387	25,387	Ministry of Land Transport and Light Rail (MLTR)
Grand Total		190,000	4,420,000	230,000	200,000	300,000	5,340,000		260,607	5,600,607	

4. Core Indicators (comment provided by Olha): Please align targets for Core Indicator 6 (GHG emissions mitigated) between Core Indicator table and Annex A ?Project Results Framework?.

5. Core indicators (comments provided by Seo-Jeong):

- MEL: change type ?other? to ?public investment?.
- MFEPP (channeled through MLTLR and NLTA Bus modernization program): change type ?other? to ?public investment?.
- UNDP: Since there are 2 co-financing letters for (i) cash contribution and (ii) in-kind, split the amount:
 - \$50,000 Grant / Investment mobilized
 - \$10,000 In-kind / Recurrent expenditures
- RHT: as per the co-financing letter, split the amount:
 - \$6,000,000 Grant / Investment mobilized
 - \$100,000 In-kind / Recurrent expenditures
-
- 11/29/2021 MY:
- Yes, all comments were addressed.

Agency Response

B. K. 11/12/2021

We are thankful for the GEF PPO assessment. The changes made in the project package are summarized below.

1. The Project Start date was revised in CEO ER and Prodoc. The new start date is set to be January 2022. Also, the Request for Extension process was initiated with the OFP.
2. The Notification for Major Amendment form is now submitted to the GEF as part of this resubmission. Please refer to the new Annex K of the CEO ER (annexed as a separate document).
3. The GEF Budget Table was updated, and the M&E Column has the same amount of \$118,000 now. Also, Component 5 of Prodoc Total Budget and Workplan was divided into two sections with one being dedicated to M&E only. This new sub-section also has the same amount of \$118,000 for M&E activities.
4. The Core Indicator 6 was updated in Core Indicator Worksheet in CEO ER and Prodoc.
5. Table C (Confirmed Sources of C0-financing) was updated as per the GEF Comment.

Additionally, linkages with a possible GCF project and a proposed timeline for GEF project and potential GCF project was provided in this new version of CEO ER and Prodoc. For the related changes in the project documents, please refer to CEO ER, Section 6. Innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up; and UNDP Prodoc, Section IV. Results and Partnership, sub-section on Innovativeness, Sustainability, and Scaling up Potential.

Also, an official letter from Mauritius GEF OFP was received that is emphasizing the complementarity between GEF and GCF projects/initiatives. This is now attached to the CEO ER as Annex L.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

No.

please consider the following revision:

1. Output 1.3 is not related to policy. It might be put in output 3.4. Please indicate the amount GEF budget and co-financing budget for such output.
2. There is no co-financing budget for Output 2.2. Please add some to it.
3. For the project management cost (PMC), please reduce the GEF budget and raise the Co-financing budget to make the shares of the PMC over the subtotals of the GEF funding and the Co-financing identical or similar.
4. Per the OFP's LOE, the total project's budget is \$3,229,998. In the CEO ER document, the total budget of the project increased to \$5,600,607. Please provide a new letter of OFP's LOE or reduce the project budget accordingly.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	UNDP	Climate Change	100,000	3,229,998	316,350	3,646,348
Total GEF Resources			100,000	3,229,998	316,350	3,646,348

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and the CEO ER package where there is relevant element was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

We are thankful for the GEF assessment. Below, we detail the changes made in the project documents and provide further clarifications for some points raised by GEFSEC.

1. Output 1.3 is what we would classify as "Policy Research" essentially developing research and knowledge product development work that enable and lead to conducive policy and regulatory framework for E-Mobility and its eventual scale-up. The Component 3 and its outputs and activities, on the other hand, are primarily focused on conducting technical feasibility studies, analyzing technical and institutional capacity

gaps, and delivering training and capacity building programs to bridge some of these capacity gaps (although some regulatory analysis will also be conducted under Output 3.1). Hence, given the above clarification, we suggest keeping the Output 1.3 under Outcome 1. We are looking forward to GEF assessment and final guidance on this.

Additionally, UNDP CO cash co-financing of US\$ 30,000 has been added to Output 1.3 in the overall project co-finance (total UNDP cash co-financing amounts to \$50,000 in this new version of project package).

2. Co-financing amount stated in CEO-ER for Component 2 (which is now US\$ 35 Million) has been split between Outputs 2.1 and 2.2. This is now reflected to Table B of CEO ER.

3. GEF PMC budget of US\$ 260,607 amounts to 4.65% of overall GEF budget of US\$ 5,600,607, which is below the 5% limit recommended by GEF.

PMC co-finance has now been increased to US\$1,730,000, which includes co-finance from stakeholders of US\$ 1,710,000 and UNDP's cash co-finance for PMC of US\$ 20,000.

Overall co-finance is now increased to US\$ 37,360,000 from earlier US\$ 37,310,000, due to additional US\$ 50,000 cash co-finance from UNDP CO (split as US\$ 30,000 for Component 1 (Output 1.3) and US\$ 20,000 for PMC).

4. New LoE with revised GEF budget has been re-submitted to GEF portal.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

The UNDP needs to put some cash co-financing for this project.

The GEF expects the GCF's co-financing letter for the PIF-planned \$300,000 investment in the project.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and the CEO ER package where there is any relevant element was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

1. US\$ 50,000 cash co-finance from UNDP has been provided to the Project. This is split as US\$ 30,000 for Component 1 (Output 1.3) and US\$ 20,000 for PMC. Overall co-finance is now increased to US\$ 37,360,000 from earlier US\$ 37,310,000

2. Based on the recent meetings with GEF SEC and GCF, we have made the following changes to the project documentation:

- We confirm that no GCF co-financing letter can be provided.
- References to GEF resources being used for the preparation of a GCF project have been removed. To be in line with this, Output 1.3 has been renamed as: *Output 1.3: Feasibility studies and analysis that could lead to the preparation of an Investment Program to scale up low-carbon transport in Mauritius.*
- Activity 1.3.2 was revised as: *Activity 1.3.2: Definition of possible investment approaches on low-carbon transport development, including electrification of the public transport.*
- A new activity 2.1.4 was added to the project to enable providing lessons learnt to any investment program development efforts: *Activity 2.1.4: Lessons-learnt reports are prepared to guide future investment program ideas. The project will prepare 2 lessons-*

learnt reports one at the second year and another at the end of the capital subsidy program implementation. These reports will summarise the experiences from the implementation of the program and define suggestions for future implementation. This will also contribute to the Investment Program preparations under Output 1.3.

- Timing of several activities were adjusted to ensure logical sequencing between project activities and future Investment Programming.

- To ensure having a cross-cutting approach (mitigation vs adaptation), improvements were made in several activities (Activity 1.1.1; Activity 1.1.2; Activity 1.2.1; Activity 2.1.3; Activity 2.2.3; Activity 3.1.1; Activity 3.1.2; Activity 3.3.4)

- References to a potential follow-up GCF project, including use of the PPF, are made in the Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling Up section. The appropriate text in this section, as well as the draft roadmap, is currently being discussed with the OFP.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, Annex C is attached to the CEO ER document.

Agency Response

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

7/23/2021 MY:

No.

1. It seems that the calculation of GHG reduction may not correct. Per the data in the CEO ER document, the GEF needs to spend \$167 in mitigating one tonne of CO₂, which is not cost-effective. Please double check the data, assumptions and methodology of GHG accounting, and redo the calculation if necessary.

2. Please fill the missing data for indicator 6.3.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, all comments were addressed and the CEO ER package where there is any relevant element was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

UNDP is thankful to GEF for this assessment. Below we are presenting the new calculations made for the GHG emissions reductions. Also, the GHG emission reduction methodology and estimates are now added to the CEO-ER as a new Annex J.

1. GHG Emission reduction estimates (both direct and indirect) have been revised since the earlier estimates were only made until 2030, whereas buses deployed under this project would have a useful life of 15 years from the year of deployment and hence, direct GHG emission reductions have now been computed until 2040.

Similarly, indirect GHG emissions have been revised with increased estimated deployment of e-buses (500 additional e-buses for public transport estimated to be deployment and at a 50% causality factor of the project, 250 of these e-buses are estimated to be due to the project's interventions). These buses would also have a life of 15 years each and hence, indirect GHG emission reduction estimates have been computed until 2044.

With these revisions, the project is now estimated to create the following environmental benefits of avoided externality of CO2 emissions:

Assuming a combination of solar powered and grid electricity powered charging is used for charging the 60 feeder or long-route e-buses to be used in Mauritius, which, when deployed, are estimated to operate for about 150 km per day, each e-bus is estimated to reduce 90.57 tons of CO2e per annum when combined with 15 solar powered charging stations of capacity 50 kWp each. So 60 buses would achieve **direct GHG benefits of 76,624 tCO2e by 2040**. Consequential (indirect) GHG benefits are calculated based on a conservative assumption that after the completion of this project's implementation, it would be scaled-up to 500 additional e-buses for public transport in Mauritius over 5 years between 2026 and 2030. Applying a causality factor of 50% due to the project's intervention (due to policy/regulatory framework, financial incentive package, capacity building and awareness raising), emissions due to 250 of these additional e-buses are considered for estimating indirect CO2 emission reduction from this project. At the same conservative assumptions of 1 kg of CO2e per km of e-bus operation and average of 150 km per day of e-bus operation for the additional 250 buses between 2026 and 2030 (combined with 25 solar powered charging stations), consequential **indirect GHG emission reductions from this project are estimated to be 316,091 tCO2e by 2044**. Hence, overall GHG benefits from this project (direct and indirect) is estimated to be 392,716 tCO2e until 2044.

Given the GEF grant sum of US \$5,600,607, the GEF cost per ton of avoided CO2eq emissions is about \$14.26.

2. Energy savings estimates in MJ have also been computed and updated. These changes have been reflected to CEO ER (Please refer to Annex J for GHG and energy savings calculations) and Prodoc as well as their annexes.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is stated on pages 17-21.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is stated on pages 21-27.

Agency Response

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is stated on pages 27-28.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF7 CCM focal area.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 40-42.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 42-43. But more detailed calculation needs to be double checked and verified.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, new GHG accounting document was reviewed.

Agency Response

1. GHG Emission reduction estimates (both direct and indirect) have been revised since the earlier estimates were only made until 2030, whereas buses deployed under this project would have a useful life of 15 years from the year of deployment and hence, direct GHG emission reductions have now been computed until 2040.

Similarly, indirect GHG emissions have been revised with increased estimated deployment of e-buses (500 additional e-buses for public transport estimated to be deployment and at a 50% causality factor of the project, 250 of these e-buses are estimated to be due to the project's interventions). These buses would also have a life of 15 years each and hence, indirect GHG emission reduction estimates have been computed until 2044.

With these revisions, the project is now estimated to create the following environmental benefits of avoided externality of CO₂ emissions.

Assuming a combination of solar powered and grid electricity powered charging is used for charging the 60 feeder or long-route e-buses to be used in Mauritius, which, when deployed, are estimated to operate for about 150 km per day, each e-bus is estimated to reduce 90.57 tons of CO₂e per annum when combined with 15 solar powered charging stations of capacity 50 kWp each. So 60 buses would achieve **direct GHG benefits of 76,624 tCO₂e by 2040**. Consequential (indirect) GHG benefits are calculated based on a conservative assumption that after the completion of this project's implementation, it would be scaled-up to 500 additional e-buses for public transport in Mauritius over 5 years between 2026 and 2030. Applying a causality factor of 50% due to the project's intervention (due to policy/regulatory framework, financial incentive package, capacity building and awareness raising), emissions due to 250 of these additional e-buses are considered for estimating indirect CO₂ emission reduction from this project. At the same conservative assumptions of 1 kg of CO₂e per km of e-bus operation and average of 150 km per day of e-bus operation for the additional 250 buses between 2026 and 2030 (combined with 25 solar powered charging stations), consequential **indirect GHG**

emission reductions from this project are estimated to be 316,091 tCO₂e by 2044. Hence, overall GHG benefits from this project (direct and indirect) is estimated to be 392,716 tCO₂e until 2044.

Given the GEF grant sum of US \$5,600,607, the GEF cost per ton of avoided CO₂eq emissions is about \$14.26.

The GHG emission reduction methodology and calculations are now added to the CEO-ER as Annex J.

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
7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 43-45.

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
7/23/2021 MY:

No.

Please attach a project map and elaborate project coordination.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

The Project map that was previously attached as Annex E to CEO-ER, is a full map of Mauritius and does not indicate specific locations within the country. This was since project is expected to cover whole country and pilot bus routes will be identified after the initial feasibility studies to be undertaken during the first years of the project and the

private companies to participate to the project implementation with their specific operation routes.

Now, an additional map has been included in the new version of the CEO-ER, which shows major bus routes and their terminal points in Mauritius. Exact bus routes on which proposed Electric Buses will be deployed and exact locations of proposed solar powered charging stations haven't been decided as of now and hence, the newly added map provides a broad overview of major bus routes in Mauritius.

We do have the current detailed list of bus routes and their time schedule but those are in text format and not in a map format. They can be provided if deemed by the GEF.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

Please show the names of project stakeholders to match the outputs of the project in Table B. In the description of project components, please indicate which organizations

or project stakeholders will execute the sub-components of capital investments for technology demonstrations.

Please elaborate whether this project will benefit or impact any Indigenous or minority Peoples and Local Communities. If so, please show evidence that they have been consulted with the project impacts. Please indicate which stakeholders will be affected by the project on ground and how they have been consulted.

Please ensure that the project document should include information about the future roles of stakeholders and proposed means of future engagement. Please check if the future roles of stakeholders have been identified. Please demonstrate how the project keeps engaging stakeholders through adequate means.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

1. Table B of CEO-ER has been updated with key stakeholders for each Output. For Capital Investment Outputs (Outputs 2.1 and 2.2), the Project's IP, Ministry of Land Transport and Light Rail (MLTLR) will manage the project funds, and UNDP does not foresee any other organization to execute these outputs.

Detailed description of all project components, outputs and activities have now been included in CEO-ER Section 3 after Theory of Change diagram. These include description of key stakeholders for each project activity and output (same as that included in Table B).

2. Mauritius does not have any indigenous population. During PPG stakeholder consultations, meetings and consultations were carried out with CSOs to ensure that no minority groups are left behind. Detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been included in Annex H of CEO-ER document (it was previously included only as an annex to Project Document), and this provides details of stakeholders that have been consulted and the project's detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan. An explanatory text has been added to the CEO ER Stakeholders section to further clarify this and the section currently includes the following text:

UNDP does not anticipate that any stakeholders will be adversely affected by the project. Nevertheless, risks associated with this project have been identified, their impact and probability have been assessed and mitigation measures have been devised to minimize their probability of occurrence and impact in accordance with UNDP's Atlas Risk Log and its Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) report and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) annex provided with this document. Project communication and grievance redressal mechanisms have been described in ESMF and will be operationalized during project implementation.

Mauritius does not have any indigenous population. During PPG stakeholder consultations, meetings and consultations were carried out with CSOs to ensure that no minority groups are left behind.

3. Detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been included in Annex H of CEO-ER document (it was previously included only as an annex to Project Document), and this provides details of roles of various stakeholders that have been identified, discussed, and elaborated.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

The description on gender issues on pages 49-51 seems too general. Please elaborate preliminary issues, gender gaps or opportunities or any findings on gender-specific context of the project, describes plans to address gender issues during the project development phase. For example, please show any planned gender responsive measures/activities to address gender gaps and promote gender equality and women's empowerment that is related to the project.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

Detailed Gender Analysis and Action Plan has been included in Annex I of CEO-ER document (it was previously included only as an annex to Project Document), and this provides details of key gender issues in public transport sector in Mauritius and action plan that includes gender responsive measures to address gender gaps and promote equal access to public transport to women in Mauritius. These measures and activities have been integrated in the project's outputs and activities and in Project Results Framework.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 51-53.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Not completed yet.

1. Please do more analysis on Climate Risk Screening. Specifically, please double check to ensure that climate risks are identified, listed and described per the guidance of STAP. See <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

This includes but not limited to:

1.1. Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations, which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc.).

1.2. Showing risks with a time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050).

1.3. Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above. This means elaborating a narrative that describes how the climate scenarios indicated above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050.

1.4. Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and climate risk mitigation measures during PPG. The STAP guidance shows more details on it.

2. Please do undertake more detailed analysis on the risks and opportunities caused by COVID-19, and respond the following three questions:

2.1 General: Describe briefly how the pandemic overall is addressed in the project, including associated impacts, risks and opportunities. Projects are required to identify and establish likely impacts and risks from COVID-19, and how they will be dealt with in the context of delivering global environment benefits and climate adaptation and resilience benefits.

2.2 Risk analysis: Please consider any risks and measures to deal with the risks that are caused by COVID-19 and post-COVID-19. These risks include (1) availability of Technical Expertise and Capacity and Changes in Timelines in the selected provinces; and (2) any expected financing from the government and co-financing from all stakeholders. Please describe further how risks from COVID-19 have been analyzed and mitigation strategies incorporated into the design of this project. The project is expected to include consideration to the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of project implementation.

2.3 Opportunity analysis: Describe further how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts (if any) created by COVID-19 to deliver GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits and contribute toward green recovery and building back the economy.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

1. Climate Risk Screening based on STAP guidance has been completed. Risk 12 in UNDP Risk Register and Risk 10 in SESP focus on climate change related risks to the project outcomes and suitable risk mitigation measures have been identified and described. This has now been explicitly described in the Risk Register and SESP in

CEO-ER document. Besides, additional details have been included in 'Risks' section of CEO-ER (and ProDoc) to explain the climate change related risk screening and assessment conducted as per STAP guidance during PPG stage, including assessment of risks and impacts of climate change on transport sector as detailed in Mauritius' 3rd National Communication on Climate Change. Similarly, the project team has incorporated climate change risk related additional specific requirements to certain activities. (Activity 1.1.1, Activity 1.2.1, Activity 2.1.3, Activity 2.2.3, Activity 3.1.1 and Activity 3.1.2)

2. Risk 1 and 2 in UNDP Risk Register pertain to Covid-19 risks and opportunities, and risk mitigation measures and other issues related to Covid19 impact have been described in the Risk Register included in CEO-ER. This has now been explicitly described in the Risk Register in CEO-ER document. Also, additional details have been included in 'Risks' section of CEO-ER (and ProDoc) to explain Covid19 related risk screening and assessment conducted as per STAP guidance during PPG stage, and risk mitigation measures that have been built into the project's activities.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

No.

Please use a diagram to present the institutional structure with major stakeholders of the project including the private sector and monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Please describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other similar initiatives that are financed by other institutions.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response Project institutional structure major stakeholders, monitoring and coordination at project level has been included in CEO-ER 'Section 6 Institutional

Arrangement and Coordination? (this was previously included only in Section IX: Governance and Management Arrangements of Project Document. This now also includes institutional structure diagram.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 73-75.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, this issue was addressed in the PIF and enhanced on pages 75-76 of the CEO ER document.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, the Social and Environmental Screening Template is attached to the GEF Portal.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on page 81.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented on pages 81-83.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Not yet.

Please provide a project map and put it in Annex D of the CEO ER document.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

Project map previously attached in Annex E of CEO-ER document, is just a full map of Mauritius and not specific locations with the country.

An additional map has been included in the new version of CEO-ER which shows major bus routes and their terminal points in Mauritius. Exact bus routes on which proposed Electric Buses will be deployed and exact locations of proposed solar powered charging stations haven't been decided as of now and hence, the newly added map provides a broad overview of major bus routes in Mauritius.

We do have the current detailed list of bus routes and their time schedule but those are in text format and not in a map format. IT can be provided if necessary.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is Presented in Annex A.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Not yet.

In the PIF stage, the GEF SEC made the following comments for the Agency to address at the CEO ER stage. Please put the responses to these comments in Annex B.

With regards to the section on Coordination, as the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an ?exceptional? basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the

PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

This comment has now been included in CEO-ER Annex B and the following response has been provided:

Project is being implemented under full NIM modality, where there is no execution role for UNDP. Separation of implementation and execution roles have been described in the GEF checklist submitted.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, the agency's responses to the Council comments are presented on Annex B on pages 93-102.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

Not completed at this time.

Please check STAP's comments on the project and put the responses to Annex B.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response Two STAP comments have been added to Annex B of CEO-ER and PPG team's responses have been provided for each.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/23/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/23/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/23/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/23/2021 MY:

Yes, it is presented in Annex C.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/23/2021 MY:

Not yet. Please provide a map in Annex C.

10/21/2021 MY:

Yes, the comment was addressed and the CEO ER package was revised accordingly.

Agency Response

Project map previously attached in Annex E of CEO-ER document, is just a full map of Mauritius and not specific locations with the country.

An additional map has been included in the new version of CEO-ER which shows major bus routes and their terminal points in Mauritius. Exact bus routes on which proposed Electric Buses will be deployed and exact locations of proposed solar powered charging stations haven't been decided as of now and hence, the newly added map provides a broad overview of major bus routes in Mauritius.

We do have the current detailed list of bus routes and their time schedule but those are in text format and not in a map format. IT can be provided if necessary.

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

7/23/2021 MY:

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

7/23/2021 MY:

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

7/23/2021 MY:

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2021 MY:

No.

Please address comments above.

10/21/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

Please address the comments from the GEF PPO that are shown in Box 1 of this review sheet.

11/10/2021 MY:

Not at this time.

The comments on 10/26/2021 in Box 1 have not been addressed. Please read the comments in Box 1, address them and put the responses under Box 1 of this review sheet.

●11/29/2021 MY:

- Yes, all PPO's comments were addressed. The PM recommends the PPO for further clearance.

-

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of the project is to promote capital investments in developing sustainable transport infrastructure that will reduce transport related GHG emissions in Mauritius and mitigate climate change. Project approaches include engaging and building technical capacities of transport-related policymakers, regulatory and other government agencies, financial institutions, and the private sector. Four components were designed for this project, including (1) Policy and regulatory framework for public e-bus transport in Mauritius; (2) Financial incentive package for electric buses and charging infrastructure to remove pricing barriers; (3) Capacity building; and (4) Awareness raising to address barriers related to lack of awareness on benefits of low-carbon electric public transport.

This project is innovative in Mauritius. Due to long charging time and high prices, e-vehicles are not really used in Mauritius. This project will demonstrate new technologies to reduce charging time and new policy that will remove the barriers.

Developing e-vehicles in Mauritius will play a very important role in the country and in GEF's operations in all other SIDS. Like all other SIDS, Mauritius is small in term of

land area, with the island spanning 60 km from North to South and 40 km from East to West. No individual car owner will fear running out of power if he or she uses an e-vehicle, given that entry-level e-vehicles can easily go over 200 km before needing to be charged again. With a good example of this project, the GEF can easily scale up e-vehicle promotion in other SIDS in GEF8.

With \$5,340,000 of GEF grant, this project will mobilize \$35,630,000 from other stakeholders of the country. The project aims at mitigating 785430 tonnes of CO₂ in its lifetime period of operation.

Covid 19 crisis represents both risks and opportunities for this project. Demand for public transport has reduced significantly in the country, since the onset of the pandemic, due to fearing of infection on public transport. In the absence of a well-planned, seamlessly multimodally integrated, modern and low-carbon public transport, it will be difficult to bring back this demand for public transport in Mauritius to pre-pandemic levels and increase this demand further. In addition, Covid-19 also brings disruptions to implementation of project activities such as procurement/import of electric buses. Continued or intermittent restrictions in the country may slow down project implementation, thereby causing project delays and unable to meet its goals and targets in a timely manner.

The key opportunity is to build significant modern, low-carbon and seamlessly integrated public transport capacity so that post-pandemic demand for transport is mainly for public transport, and hence enabling post-Covid green recovery.

To mitigate risk impacts and take advantage of opportunities, the project team will develop relevant strategies and activities to ensure that post-pandemic transport demand in Mauritius will be for public transport and not for unsustainable private transport among the population in Mauritius, and that the project implementation will not be significantly affected by Covid-19.