



Enhancing Electric Vehicle Mobility and Integration in Fiji's Land Transport Sector

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11078

Countries

Fiji

Project Name

Enhancing Electric Vehicle Mobility and Integration in Fiji's Land Transport Sector

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/24/2024

Review completed by PM

7/24/2024

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

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

EBF 10/24/2024:

2. All executing partners are mentioned in the General Project Information table. Cleared.

EBF 10/23/2024:

2. The General Child Project Information Table should allow inputting of multiple executing partners. Only the Ministry of Public Works, Meteorological Services and Transport is currently mentioned. Kindly include GGGI in the Project Information Table per the revised LOE.

EBF 10/22/2024:

1. The titled has been updated by our ITS team. Cleared.
2. Please ensure that the project executing partners in the General Child Project information Table match the revised letter of endorsement: "Ministry of Public Works, Meteorological Services and Transport" (without "Department of Transport" at the beginning and "Fiji" at the end) and the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI). Also, ensure to specify the project executing type for GGGI.

Extract from revised LOE:

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by the Ministry of Public Works, Meteorological Services and Transport, and the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) as executing partners¹. I request the GEF Implementing Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement / Approval.

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. We will liaise with ITS and get back to you via email regarding the title change.
2. Noted. We will wait for the updated LOE to address this comment.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. The project title "Sustainable Mobility in Fiji" "Decarbonizing Public Buses" does not reflect the objective and scope of the project, which, as per the components, goes beyond public buses and focuses also on public taxis and e-bikes. Please rephrase the project title to make it more consistent with the objective and scope of the project.
2. The execution partner as per the project information sheet and the LOE, i.e., Climate Change Division, Office of the Prime Minister of Fiji, doesn't match the execution partner included in the institutional arrangement section, i.e., Strategic Planning Office under the Ministry of Finance and Global Green Growth Institute, GGGI. Also, the budget only includes GGGI as the responsible partner. Please clarify and amend accordingly and ensure that the letter of endorsement, the project information sheet and institutional arrangements section are consistent.

Agency Response

Response 23/10/2024

GGGI's name has been included in the Project Information table as one of the executing partners. Thanks for highlighting this.

Response 22/10/2024

The Name of EA is aligned with that in the LOE.

Response 18/10/2024

1. Thanks for updating the portal with the new title.
2. New LOE signed by the current GEF OFP has been uploaded reflecting the executing partners and footnote 1.

Response 02/10/2024

1. The project title has been changed to "Enhancing Electric Vehicle Mobility and Integration in Fiji's Land Transport Sector". Unfortunately, this can't be changed as it is has been locked from the concept stage. We will need GEF's help in changing it in the portal.
2. The EA from government side will be the "Ministry of Public Works, Meteorological Services and Transport (MPWMST)". At the concept stage it was agreed that CCD will be the EA. During PPG CCD in consultation with the partners proposed SPO as the EA. But at the time of submission we were informed that this decision is under consideration as the Min for Transport may be appointed the EA. Therefore, a revised letter was not received. A new letter with the correct EA partners is now being obtained.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

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 EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

EBF 10/22/2024:

3. Cleared. The M&E component is now financed by GEF project financing and co-financing.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) ⓘ						
M&E	Technical Assistance	Outcome 5: The project is effectively monitored and evaluated	5.1: Monitoring and evaluation products are delivered	GET	72,288.00	300,000.00

EBF 10/16/2024:

- 1. Noted, gender dimensions are not included in the title of each output per se, but gender dimensions are present at the output level in the project description section. Cleared.
- 2. Cleared. The PMC contribution from GEF project financing is 10% and the co-financing contribution was adjusted to 12.5%.
- 3. An outcome and output have been included for M&E. Please adjust the budget so that M&E is financed not only by GEF financing but also by co-financing.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please ensure that gender dimensions are incorporated at the output level.
2. The PMC contribution from GEF project financing is 10% but the co-financing contribution is 8.4%. Please amend by increasing the co-financing portion and/or reducing the GEF portion so both amounts are proportional.
3. Also, 100% of M&E costs are financed by GEF financing, and no outcomes or outputs are included in the table. Please include them in the M&E component field.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) ⓘ			
M&E	Technical Assistance		72,289.00
		GET	
			1,625,000.00
		Sub Total (\$)	
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
		GET	162,500.00
		Sub Total(\$)	162,500.00
		Total Project Cost(\$)	1,787,500.00

Please provide justification

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

1. The gender aspect reflected in the deliverables and explained in the narrative of outputs is now reflected in the output language.
2. & 3. Part of co-finance for PMC included resources for M&E. This is now reflected in the M&E section. The PMC co-finance is 10% of total co-finance.

Response 02/10/2024

1. The gender dimension are well integrated at the output level. The text already included in previous submission is highlighted in blue. A couple of places a new text is added to address the comment, highlighted in yellow.
2. The co-finance has been revised and the suggestion is addressed.
3. The Outcome and Output statement are added in the table as well in the Project description.

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

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Paragraph 4 of the section "Drivers for EV adoption" has a repeated sentence. Please correct.

"The uptake of EVs by taxis has the potential to drive the adoption of EVs across other segments, but most importantly reduces a larger share of tail-pipe emissions than normal LDVs due to high mileage."

2. Please provide more detail about the status of the deployment of electric mobility and NMT in the country, including the modes of transport that will be addressed by the project (e.g. taxis and buses). Based on a quick online search, it seems a few EV fleets have already been introduced to the country. This includes describing any ongoing initiative, such as the Technical Working Group for E-Mobility mentioned in the project description.

Agency Response

Response 02/10/2024

- 1) Repeated paragraph in Portal is deleted. Thanks for highlighting it.
- 2) Additional information is provided in the Transport baseline segment.

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

EBF 10/16/2024:

6.1. Cleared.

9. Gender actions are now integrated. Cleared.

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. Cleared

2. Regarding "Baseline and ongoing projects" section (that used to be in the Project Description):

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared. The Secretariat of the Platform has been changed to the Department of Transport, Ministry of Public Works, of the Meteorology Services and Transport.
5. Noted, thanks for the clarification. Cleared.
6. Regarding Component 3 and Annex R:
 1. Thank you for the clarification. We encourage you to include a summary of your explanation as an introduction to component 3. It would help other readers understand the relevance of electrifying taxis.
 2. Information is now contained in Annex M. Cleared.
 3. Thank you for your explanation. Cleared.
 4. Cleared.
 5. Cleared.
7. Cleared
8. Cleared
9. In case you didn't see our comment from 8/27/2024. On gender, please ensure that gender-specific activities are budgeted, and during project implementation, the PIRs, the MTE and the TE should include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project. As a good practice, please ensure that elements of the Gender Action Plan are linked to the Project Components.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. [General comment] This section has different fonts and font sizes. Please improve the formatting of the text in this section by using a font that is easier to read, differentiating titles from the rest of the text, and including spacing between paragraphs.
2. Regarding the "Baseline and ongoing projects" section
 1. Please move this section to the "Project Rationale" section and merge it with Annex Q (List of Baseline Projects). All relevant information should be contained in the CEO Approval document since this is the document that is circulated and reviewed by the GEF Council members.
 2. Include a reference to the work done by the GEF-funded and UNEP-led ISLANDS program on [waste management](#) and, if applicable, their work on [end-of-life vehicle management](#). This project is included in Annex Q.
3. Similarly, please move the "Alignment with National Priorities" section to the "Project Rationale" and merge it with Annex P. All relevant information should be contained in the CEO Approval document since this is the document that is circulated and reviewed by the GEF Council members.
4. Regarding Output 1, please refer to our comment on the structure of the Inter-Sectoral Coordination Platform in the "Institutional Arrangements and Coordination" section. Please ensure this output is consistent with this comment.

5. Output 1.3 focuses on EV and EV supply equipment standards. Given the accelerated growth of ICE and HEV vehicles, should the project also consider addressing fuel or efficiency standards for these vehicles and/or other regulations to hinder the import of highly inefficient vehicles or second-hand vehicles beyond their lifespan?
6. Regarding Component 3 and Annex R:
 1. Please justify why the project will focus on electric taxis instead of other modes of transportation in Fiji.
 2. We couldn't find Annex S, but we found information related to the demonstration project in Annex R in the documents section. Please amend the reference to Annex S.
 3. Please clarify whether it is assumed that all recipients of the demonstration who hold taxi licenses and are seeking vehicles are also the drivers of those vehicles. In many cities, the taxi license or vehicle owner is not always the driver. In other cases, the vehicle may be owned by a third party and operated by multiple drivers to maximize its operation.
 4. We note that you plan to define the charging infrastructure and configuration during the implementation phase. However, we encourage you to consider a configuration that maximizes operational efficiency. Overnight charging with slow chargers might be suitable if taxis are parked for several hours during the day. However, if the vehicles are expected to operate with minimal downtime or lack access to a dedicated charging location, we recommend considering fast charging options.
 5. Regarding Component 3, we recommend that you also consider including the representation of the Insurance sector to help ensure that the projects covered by the demonstration project can be covered by insurance. This could also help to share lessons learned from the demonstrations with these stakeholders.
7. Please consider elaborating further on the socio-economic benefits of the project, including not only GHG reductions but also health benefits related to other pollutants such as PM, CO, SO_x, NO_x, etc.
8. After describing the project components and before the institutional arrangement section, the agency unintentionally left some internal comments that should be removed.

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

6. 1. - The reason for considering Taxis for pilot is summarized in the Output 3 description as suggested.
9. Gender actions are well integrated in the project. They are now included in the output language, they are part of the Result Framework, and M&E section specific includes monitoring and review/evaluation of gender action plan implementation. A gender expert will be working on the project and support all the outputs to ensure implementation of recommendations of GAP.

Response 02/10/2024

1. The font has been aligned with the other sections.
2. Baseline and ongoing projects:
 1. As mentioned the information is moved to the Project Rationale. The sections were shortened given the word limits suggested. As mentioned the text from Annexes is included in the section.
 2. ISLANDs project information is included in the Baseline projects table.
 3. This has been addressed by moving to Project Rationale and bringing in the information from Annex.
 4. This has been addressed in the portal and CEO doc.
 5. Thanks for the suggestion. The work proposed is already underway in the Department of Transport (DOT). Therefore, the project will not be covering it. But it will closely work with the project, as the EA for this project too is DOT. Please note Output 1.2 has been removed as Government of Fiji got support from another donor to undertake that work.
 6. Regarding Component 3
 1. The focus on electric taxis for this pilot project in Fiji is strategically justified by several key factors. Taxis represent a high-mileage fleet in Fiji, averaging 200 km per day, which is significantly higher than government vehicles. This high usage translates to substantial potential for greenhouse gas emission reduction, estimated at 10.78 tCO₂e per annum. This is also the reason why the viability of taxis is better than personnel cars. For each ICE taxi replaced with an EV. Taxis play a crucial role in Fiji's transport ecosystem, particularly in urban areas where they account for 12% of all trips. They serve as an important bridge between the prevalent non-motorized transport (with 53% of all trips made on foot) and the low rate of private car ownership (16% of households). As Fiji undergoes economic development and urbanization, targeting taxis for electrification can help shape sustainable transport patterns. Moreover, the high visibility of taxis, especially in urban areas and at key locations like Nadi Airport, makes them ideal for raising public awareness about EVs. The project also offers significant economic benefits to taxi drivers through reduced operating costs, estimated at 55.3% lower than ICE taxis. By leveraging existing initiatives like the Fiji Development Bank's EV loan product and working with established entities like the Nadi Airport Taxi fleet, the project aims to maximize environmental impact, visibility, and economic benefits while working within Fiji's current transport landscape. They also have a higher visibility and thus create a better avenue for awareness. Buses too were considered but it was found to have high incremental cost and with low fares difficult to finance. The Bus owners association consulted requested that a full assessment should be done to see how these buses could be introduced without affecting affordability and viability for private owners.
 2. Annex S reference is corrected.
 3. The project is designed to target the decision-makers in the taxi industry who are responsible for vehicle replacement, primarily the owners and license holders. This approach acknowledges the diverse business models within Fiji's taxi sector. In many cases, the taxi owner or license holder is not the driver of the vehicle. Some taxis are owned by individuals who employ drivers, while others are part of small fleets owned by operators. There are also instances where the owner and driver are the same person. The project's flexibility in targeting owners/license holders rather than exclusively drivers allows it to accommodate this variety of

operational structures. Both Suva and Nadi have several taxi operators with owned fleets, but it's important to note that the majority of taxis in Fiji operate independently (incl. Taxis serving Nadi airport), not as part of larger fleets. By focusing on the license holders and vehicle owners, the project aims to influence the key decision-makers across different business models within the industry. This approach serves two primary purposes. First, it ensures that the project can reach a broad cross-section of the taxi industry, from individual owner-operators to small fleet owners. Second, it provides the Fiji Development Bank (FDB) with a diverse set of case studies and experiences to inform future scaling up of electric vehicle financing in the taxi sector.

4. The current plan is to provide each taxi owner with a home charging station, as most taxis in Fiji are typically parked at the vehicle owner's house during nighttime hours. The majority of taxis operate from around 6 am to 7-8 pm, allowing for ample overnight charging time using slow chargers. However, we acknowledge the importance of maximizing operational efficiency and will conduct a thorough analysis during the implementation phase to determine the most suitable charging configuration. This analysis will consider various factors, including typical operating hours, vehicle downtime, and potential for on-demand night services. While overnight slow charging at home appears to be the most practical solution for most taxi owners, the project will also explore the feasibility and potential benefits of incorporating fast charging options at strategic locations. This could provide additional flexibility for taxis that operate extended hours or require quick charging during the day. This is reflected in output 3.

5. This has been included in the Output 3.

7. This comment is addressed.

8. Thanks for highlighting them. They have been removed.

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

EBF 10/22/2024:

1. Cleared. The institutional arrangement and coordination section is aligned with the revised LOE.

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. We will wait for the updated LOE to address this comment.

2. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. The execution partner as per the project information sheet and the LOE, i.e., Climate Change Division, Office of the Prime Minister of Fiji, doesn't match the execution partner included in the institutional arrangement section, i.e., Strategic Planning Office under the Ministry of Finance and Global Green Growth Institute, GGGI. Also, the budget only includes GGGI as the responsible partner. Please clarify and amend accordingly and ensure that the letter of endorsement, the project information sheet and institutional arrangements section are consistent.
2. Regarding the Inter-sectoral coordination platform, established under Output 1.1 and further described in this section. This platform is very much welcomed to ensure key ministries and entities across different sectors take part in any decision related to the promotion of electric mobility in the country, particularly given the intersectoral focus on sustainable mobility. The proposal states that the Platform will not only oversee the project but is also intended to exist beyond its completion to steer future projects and policies. We also noted that the platform is chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Finance, with GGGI as the Secretariat. However, to ensure consistency beyond the proposed project, please consider the Secretariat of the Platform being hosted by a government agency instead of an external agency (i.e., GGGI in this case).

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

1. A new LOE is included as mentioned above.

Response 02/10/2024

1. This has been addressed as explained above.
2. The new EA will be Department of Transport (DOT), MPWMST. The Platform is a coordination body and will be hosted at the EA. The DOT will act as the secretariat. This has been corrected.

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

EBF 10/23/2024:

1. Cleared.

EBF 10/22/2024:

1. Please briefly explain in the methodological field why the anticipated start year of accounting is 2029.

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. Cleared
2. The anticipated start year of accounting is 2040. Is this right? This date seems out of place because the project has direct emission reductions. Please correct this date or explain in the methodological field after the core indicators why you have chosen this date.

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use)

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at MTR)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	140,624	553,216		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	321,501	1,286,004		
Anticipated start year of accounting	2029	2040		
Duration of accounting	10	15		

3. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please provide the spreadsheet (in Excel format) calculating GHG savings so the GEF Sec can check the calculations and assumptions made.
2. Emissions to be mitigated seem to take place outside AFOLU (6.2), but are recorded under 6.1. Please adjust as necessary and ensure that the currently missing anticipated start year and duration of accounting are added. In case the anticipated start year of accounting is 2029, just as it was stated at the PIF stage, please explain in the methodological field why the start year is so late and consider preponing as appropriate.
3. No explanation seems to be provided explaining why there is no target for the Energy Saved indicator at CEO Endorsement, whereas a target was identified at PIF stage. Please provide as appropriate along with an explanation of the methodology used to identify the target. The PIF value seemed high.

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

The start year at PIF is listed as 2029. For the CEO DOC it is 2025. A line has been added to explain why the start year was 2029.

Response 02/10/2024

1. This has been included. The sheet covers GHG estimations for all programme countries. Each country is separately reflected.
2. The error is regretted and has been corrected.
3. This was an oversight and has been corrected.

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

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Under the Overall Risk category, please provide a summary that helps understand the identified rating.

Agency Response

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 Request N/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 EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 Request N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

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 RequestEBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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 Request N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/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

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. ?Contingency? is not an eligible category ? please remove it and return the funds.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG) ⓘ

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Expert Costs for Project Development	41,100.00	41,100.00	
Workshops	4,400.00	4,400.00	
Contingency	2,862.00	2,862.00	
Total	48,362.00	48,362.00	0.00

Agency Response

Response 02/10/2024

This has been addressed. The funds were used for travel of expert to the country.

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 EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

EBF 10/22/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Please disregard comment 2 from 10/16/2024. It was our mistake as explained via email. Cleared.

EBF 10/16/2024:

1. Please clarify if the \$45,000 the Fiji Development Bank mentioned in their co-finance letter will also be considered in-kind contribution to the project. If so, please reflect it in the portal form.







I am pleased to inform you of FDB's co-financing support by providing staff time during the implementation of the project for a total of around US\$100,000.00, over the 4 years of the project.

Furthermore, through the French Development Agency's (AFD) co-financing support of US\$45,000 in the form of technical assistance to strengthen FDB's EV financial products over the 1 year (2025) of the project.

2. There is a mismatch between the co-finance letter from the Ministry of Public Works, Meteorological Services, and Transport and the amount expressed and type of co-financing in the portal form. The co-finance letter mentions three contributions to the project: (1) a grant of up to \$500k, (2) an in-kind contribution of \$100k, and (3) an investment mobilized of \$15.7MM. The portal form captures only the third contribution. Per our guidelines, the amount specified in the co-finance letter must be consistent with the amount specified in the portal form. Please address.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please upload the co-financing letters to the CEO approval document so they can be reviewed by the GEF Sec.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Upload letters of co-finance
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Finance	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	8,500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Finance	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Climate Change Division, Office of the Prime Minister	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00	
Donor Agency	DFAT Australia	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00	
Donor Agency	GCF	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	200,000.00	
Others	GGGI	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	169,475.00	
Total Co-financing(\$)				9,969,475.00	

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

1. Yes indeed the USD 45,000 from AFD via FDB will be provided towards work under component 3. This has been included in the project document.

2. We are not sure if we understood the comment. Yes it is correct that Ministry of Public Works, Metrological Services, and Transport include 3 different funding, USD 100,000 (in-kind), Grant of USD 500,000 and Investment of 15.7 Million USD. All three are reflected in the Portal section of co-finance as can be seen in the Table on Co-finance in Annex A.

Response 02/10/2024

The Cofinancing is revised with the change in EA. The CO-finance letters are attached.

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 Request

EBF 10/22/2024: Yes, a revised LOE has been provided. It is signed by Dr. Sivendra Michael, GEF OFP since 02/14/2024. Cleared.

EBF 10/16/2024: The agency has expressed it is in the process of obtaining an updated LOE. This comment is yet to be resolved.

EBF 8/27/2024: No. Mr. Pita Wise signed the LOE. However, according to the GEF database, the OFP of Fiji since February 14, 2024, is Dr. Sivendra Michael. Please provide a new LOE signed by the GEF OFP.

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

New LOE was received and signed by the new GEF OFP. This is included.

Response 02/10/2024

A revised letter is requested and under process. This will be attached in the next round of updates. The LOE is expected soon.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 10/22/2024: Yes. Cleared.

EBF 10/16/2024: The agency has expressed it is in the process of obtaining an updated LOE. This comment is yet to be resolved.

EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. However, refer to the previous comment.

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

New LOE was received and signed by the new GEF OFP. This is included.

Response 02/10/2024

A revised letter is requested and under process. This will be attached in the next round of updates. The LOE is expected soon.

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

EBF 10/22/2024: Yes, the missing footnote from the previous LOE has now been added and follows the correct format. Cleared.

EBF 10/16/2024: The agency has expressed it is in the process of obtaining an updated LOE. This comment is yet to be resolved.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. The execution partner as per the project information sheet and the LOE, i.e., Climate Change Division, Office of the Prime Minister of Fiji, doesn't match the execution partner included in the institutional arrangement section, i.e., Strategic Planning Office under the Ministry of Finance and Global Green Growth Institute, GGGI. Also, the budget only includes GGGI as the responsible partner. Please clarify and amend accordingly and ensure that the letter of endorsement, the project information sheet and institutional arrangements section are consistent.
2. Also, ensure that the following footnote contained in the GEF-8 LOE template is included in the new LOE. Right now, it is missing.

¹ Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency

Agency Response

Response 18/10/2024

New LOE was received and signed by the new GEF OFP. This is included.

Response 02/10/2024

A revised letter is requested and under process. This will be attached in the next round of updates. The LOE is expected soon.

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

EBF 10/16/2024: Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. We encourage you to increase women's minimum level of participation, which varies between 10 and 30% depending on the indicator.

Agency Response

Response02/10/2024

The increase has been addressed but as explained in the risk section, given that transport sector employs much lower share of women even in developing countries, this may be a challenge to achieve. Hence it is indicated as a risk factor for achieving outcomes of project.

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

EBF 10/16/2024: Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. The GeoName ID do not seem to be available under the <https://www.geonames.org/> platform. Please update as appropriate.

Agency Response

Response02/10/2024

The GEONAME were added and the name of city comes up in the portal. So not sure what is the comment about.

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 EBF 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

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

EBF 10/16/2024: Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. There seems to be some redundancy in the roles of ?Project Management Support? and ?Assistant Project Manager?. Please clarify the differences and complementarity between both positions or consider merging them into a single position.

Agency Response

Response 02/10/2024

The Ast PM, who will be recruited for the project and located at the DOT office, will undertake the day to day management of the project. The Project Management Support is the supervision function provided by GGGI who will be managing the finances. This covers the costs of GGGI administration in overseeing the effective implementation of the project.

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 Request N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 10/24/2024: All comments have been addressed. The PM recommends the project for further processing.

EBF 10/23/2024: Please address the comment above related to the General Child Project Information Table, remove highlights from the Portal Form and the Agency Project Document, and resubmit. Kindly ensure that the clean agency project document (without highlights) is uploaded as "public" in the documents section of the project.

EBF 10/22/2024: Please address the comments above related to General Child Project Information Table and the Core Indicators section and resubmit. Also, include the agency project document as "public" in the documents section of the project.

EBF 10/16/2024: Please address the comments above and remove any highlights in the agency project document and portal form. Also, include the agency project document as "public" in the documents section of the project.

EBF 8/27/2024: Please address the comments above, highlight changes **in yellow** for ease of review, and resubmit. Also, include the agency project document as "public" in the documents section to include it when going on circulation to the GEF Council.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 8/27/2024: On gender, please ensure that gender-specific activities are budgeted, and during project implementation, the PIRs, the MTE and the TE should include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project. As a good practice, please ensure that elements of the Gender Action Plan are linked to the Project Components.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/27/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/23/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/24/2024