REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	**11671**
Project title	**Green Mobility Financing Facility for Africa**
Date of screen	**24 November 2024**
STAP Panel Member	**Ngonidzashe Chirinda/Mark Smith**
STAP Secretariat	**Alessandro Moscuzza**

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This regional program aims to support financing the shift to green mobility in Africa. The project proponents demonstrate a good understanding of the GHG emission and air pollution challenges related to urban mobility in Africa.

Targeting innovative blended finance interventions towards buses and 2 or 3-wheeler vehicles and establishing charging infrastructure are key steps towards green mobility. A key strength of the proposal is that it builds on previous interventions (i.e. GEF 7 and GEF 8) and emphasizes leveraging regional partnerships. There is also a strong focus on capacity building.

The proponents need to provide more details on private sector commitments or a detailed plan of private sector engagement. It will also be beneficial to explore and plan for different possible scenarios, such as those in which private sector participation is lower than anticipated. Overall, this is a good program that builds on regional momentum toward e-mobility.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

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

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

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

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines (400 words)

The proponents identify and adequately explain the key drivers of increased urban vehicle ownership and use in Africa. The reference to the NDCs puts the program in the proper national policy context. It is good that the proponents also highlight existing market barriers to green mobility solutions, which are appropriately given, including high initial investment costs, lack of access to sufficient finance, and high investor risks. To strengthen the proposal, the proponents need to explore systemic interactions fully. For example, it is important to explore how national policies and technology environments influence investment decisions in each country.

The proposal fails to provide an in-depth analysis of how the diverse transportation cultures will influence the adoption of green mobility solutions. Are there any political risks associated with the transition towards green mobility? If so, what mitigation measures will be taken? It is not clearly explained how the varied energy mixes in the different countries will affect the feasibility of green mobility. Proponents need to consider how technological changes related to green mobility will impact different aspects of the existing transport systems (i.e., workforce upskilling and consumer behavior).

The PIF is missing a comprehensive narrative that covers various scenarios, which would help to clarify expected uncertainties in investment environments or rates of technological progress or uptake of public transport and their consequences for designing a robust project.

The PIF acknowledges multiple risks, such as climate, environmental, social, political, technological, financial, and stakeholder-related issues in the Risk Table. However, whereas extreme climate events are real risks to implementation under Climate risks, the mitigation measures documented under Financial and Business model risks are already in the project design! Here the issue should be mitigating the remaining risk that the design instruments fail to be adequate. Also, this project intends to be innovative in financial instruments, so it is not unreasonable that there will be some remaining risk here. Similarly, under Fiduciary risks, the first mitigating measure (delineating roles well) should simply be part of good design – the second measure – close monitoring (and rapid action) is the proper mitigating measure here should the design governance prove inadequate. Likewise, Stakeholder risk – the mitigating measure listed has already been undertaken! But what will the project do if there is a lack of interest despite this effort? The existing risk assessment requires closer thought and more detail. Please refer to STAP's information note on clarifying risks in GEF projects for more details and guidance on documenting risks in project design.

The proponents effectively outline the current issue, its likely future course without the project, and the desired outcomes. The project objectives are well-defined and aligned with the system context, addressing key barriers to green mobility in Africa and promoting alignment with global environmental goals.

The theory of change outlined in the PIF serves as a solid foundation, presenting a credible approach to reaching the project objectives. Nonetheless, various elements need significant enhancement to create a more compelling and reliable causal chain that guarantees lasting and resilient results.

The current explanation of how project activities lead to outputs and how those outputs result in outcomes is lacking in detail. For instance, how will concessional financing effectively mitigate perceived risk and encourage private investment? What specific strategies will guarantee the long-term sustainability of green mobility initiatives? The need for institutional and behavioral changes is acknowledged, but how these changes will be accomplished is unclear.

The proposal argues for additionality by stating that the GMFA's blended finance strategy will stimulate private sector investment in green mobility that would not happen otherwise. However, the proponents need to demonstrate this additionality effectively. Given the remarkable list of aligned projects listed in Table 5, the proponents need to demonstrate why this project is needed as well, noting that this large set provides a good impetus to potential scaling.

A thorough counterfactual analysis is needed to assess the projected outcomes against a scenario without GEF funding. The level of private sector participation and co-financing is uncertain, and securing firm commitments from private investors would enhance the argument for additionality. The GHG emission reduction and co-financing estimates appear to be overly optimistic.

p.38 clause 3 notes a 'figure 4' that is missing, since it is not the Table 4 provided a few pages later. It would be a useful table to have, since Figure 2 does not in fact show the full $559m as asserted in the text (clause 2, same page).

The proponents outline the main stakeholders and their respective roles. However, despite mentioning stakeholder consultations, the proposal lacks a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan. This plan should detail the engagement methods, timelines, and how stakeholder feedback will shape project design and implementation.

There is no discussion of potential conflicts of interest or competing priorities among stakeholders, leaving a vital gap in the approach. It is crucial to address how these conflicts will be managed to ensure smooth collaboration and alignment of interests throughout the project.

The proponents mention building on prior investments and incorporating lessons learned, but a more comprehensive and convincing explanation is needed, particularly regarding policy coherence.

Section E p.52 has been ticked to confirm that there is a clear approach to knowledge management and learning – however, these 3 words do not appear anywhere in the document except in the PIF instructions! Even 'learning' only appears in relation to learning from previous work (which is good). Yet this is seeking to be an innovative approach to financing, which implies monitoring and rapid learning from success and failure – please revisit and address this issue properly – i.e. How learning from this project (in terms of what instruments work in what circumstances and why, whether some cases deliver better or worse on the GEBs, etc.) will be documented and disseminated to support intended scaling, most likely in key partnerships with other financiers who may need to be the subject of targeted information exchange during this project. How will the ToC assumptions listed on p.20 be monitored and learned about? The PIF notes the intent to document models for subsequent use (p.17 clause 13) but says nothing about how the success of these will be monitored and only vaguely indicates that these models will be available to others.

The proposal lacks clarity on GMFA's innovations, scaling strategies, and transformative change. A detailed comparison with existing initiatives, mechanisms for replication in diverse contexts, and justifications for fundamental shifts in urban mobility may need to be considered.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

1. Include a deeper analysis of systemic interactions (how policies affect private investment, technology limitations influencing financing). Socio-cultural and political factors require more detailed analysis (impact of transport culture, political risks of policy changes, regional variations).

2. In the theory of change: provide detailed explanations of causal mechanisms; incorporate uncertainty analysis (scenarios) and detailed institutional/behavioral change strategies.

3. Consider developing a contingency plan on how the project will respond to potential setbacks or unforeseen circumstances and reflect this in the Risk Table. Please refer to STAP's information note on clarifying risks in GEF projects.

4. Conduct a counterfactual analysis comparing outcomes with and without GEF funding, especially considering several other listed initiatives ongoing in the target countries.

5. Secure firm private sector commitments.

6. Use more conservative estimates in co-financing from the private sector.

7. The claim of innovation and transformation lacks detailed justification (see STAP guidance on leveraging innovation for transformation).

8. Scaling strategies lack detail in relation mechanisms, challenges, and solutions (please see STAP guidance on Scaling).

9. A credible treatment of Knowledge Management and Learning is required.

10. Emphasize the project's distinct advantages, strengths, and ability to foster lasting and transformative improvements in urban transportation throughout Africa.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?

2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives)**, based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?

3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?

4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?

5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".

    - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
    - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
    - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
    - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?

6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?

7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?

8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

   - how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
   - how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
   - how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. **Innovation and transformation:**
    - If the project is intended to be **innovative:** to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
    - If the project is intended to be **transformative:** how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)