



Integrated, Sustainable and Low Emissions Transport in the Maldives

[Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation](#)

Basic project information

GEF ID

10301

Countries

Maldives

Project Name

Integrated, Sustainable and Low Emissions Transport in the Maldives

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/29/2020

Review completed by PM

12/17/2020

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF **CEO Endorsement**

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

- 1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2020: Yes, the project remains aligned with CCM-1-2 Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for electric drive technology and electric mobility. Slight changes from child project concept have been explained. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

- 2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/1/2020: Yes, the structure of the project as presented in Table B is clear and appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2020: Yes, co-financing of \$4,408,484 has been confirmed and the investment mobilized has been explained. However, please address comments below:

- The type of co-financing for the \$2,350,284 from the Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation should be selected. We believe the best fit would be "public investment".

8/31/2020: Comment cleared.

- It appears that the \$170,000 from the Ministry of Environment that will support the purchase of solar panels to power the charging stations in the project demonstrations has been split in Table C into two (\$150,000 and \$20,000) for no apparent reason. Please clarify or combine into a single entry. Please also clarify if while the letter says this financing would be "in-kind," it does not actually represent "public investment". (Although we agree that in this case the investment is not being mobilized by the project, so it is still categorized as recurrent expenditures).

8/31/2020: Entry has been combined into a single one. Explanation for "in-kind" categorization has been provided. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

August 11 2020

- The Co-finance from MOTCA has been revised as Public Investment
- The \$170,000 USD from MOE for the solar panels for charging stations is not directly linked to the project as project focus is on introduction of e-vehicles. Hence, it was considered as in-kind investment.

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

7/1/2020: Yes, the financing remains adequate. Cleared.

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 7/1/2020: Yes, the PPG amount has been utilized and it is reported in Annex C. Cleared.

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

7/1/2020: Targets are provided for Core Indicators 6 and 11. Please address comments below

- For Indicator 6, we note an error on the anticipated start year of accounting which is entered as 2035, but that would actually be the end year. Please change to 2021.

8/31/2020: Anticipated start year has been corrected to 2023. Comment cleared.

- For Indicator 11, please provide a short explanation below the Table in the portal as to how this number of beneficiaries was estimated.

8/31/2020: Comment not cleared. Could not find explanation on target for number of beneficiaries. Please provide in the section highlighted yellow below:

**Indicator 11 Number of direct
beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as
co-benefit of GEF investment**

 View

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

The detailed calculations for GHG emission reduction are undertaken using the common methodology developed for the Global E-Mobility programme. The model has been reviewed and validated with experts. Annex M contains detailed methodology explanation and assumptions used for calculation of GHG emission reduction.



10/2/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

September 17th 2020

The explanation provided earlier in foot note 2 in now included in the main text below the table in section F. Apologies for the confusion in last submission.

August 11 2020

The project end year is 2023 according to the PIF and our project timelines. The direct emissions for project pilots have been corrected to year 2023. The indirect emissions are considered till 2035 which includes the emissions from pilot project equipment lifetime from 2024 ? 2035) and the indirect emissions due to influence of the project.

Document updated ;No. of beneficiaries has been updated and rational has been added in footnote. This has been included in below the table in the Portal.

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

7/1/2020: Yes, the project elaborates on the national scenario. However, there seem to be some inconsistencies in the information provided between this section and the baseline section. Please see below and clarify in the project document:

- What is the current mix in the electricity grid? This section says 95% is generated from fossil fuels and that there are currently 11 MW of renewable energy capacity.

11 MW of 368 MW installed capacity are renewable and 97% of electricity demand is generated by fossil fuels and 3% by renewable energy. Comment cleared.

- What is the target by 2030 for renewable energy generation? This section says a minimum of 7% peak load (80 MW) by 2030. The baseline section says the government set a target of 30% peak power through renewable energy by 2030.

Target was revised. Comment cleared.

- What is the impact of the transport sector on national emissions? This section estimates 25% of energy-related CO₂ emissions (2016). In the baseline scenario, it describes transport as responsible for 21.5% of emissions (2011) and electricity generation as 63.5%.

- How do road transport and marine transport compare in terms of GHG emissions? This section estimates 12% of total GHG emissions correspond to marine transport, while road transport accounts for 25-30% of emissions from transport. In the baseline scenario, it estimates marine GHG emissions as 67% of transport emissions, followed by road transport with 17%.

Transport represents 21.5% of GHG emissions in the country and within it road transport represents 17% while marine represents 67%. Comment cleared. Comment cleared.

- With regards to existing policies and regulations, this section says there are no vehicle efficiency standards nor import duties, and the country has no comprehensive transport plan. Yet, in the baseline scenario, the table shows several relevant transportation policies including an efficiency standard, import duty on electric cars and tariff on petrol and diesel-powered vehicles.

Comment not cleared. It appears the response below was cut off. Please revise and provide specific explanation of how these policies and strategies have been passed but not implemented.

10/2/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

September 17 2020

The incomplete paragraph has been completed, apologies for the oversight. The yellow highlighted part is the omission in the last submission.

?Though a number of policies and strategies have been developed but they have not necessarily translated into implementation of identified measures in these policies and strategies. For example, emission standards for vehicles are developed but they have not yet been implemented.?

August 11 2020

All above comments are updated in revised CEO document

The initial target for renewable share of peak load electricity was set at 30%, which has now been revised up to 70% by the government.

The 25% of energy related emissions from transport in the document refers to the global share of transport sector emissions. This has been clarified in the document.

In Maldives transport contributes 21.5% of GHG emissions. Within transport sector the Marine transport contributes 67% and road transport 17%. The earlier numbers were expressing the Marina and Road transport share in total energy related GHG emissions.

Though a number of policies and strategies have been developed but they have not necessarily translated into implementation of identified measures in these policies and strat

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2020: Yes, the project elaborates on the baseline scenario. Please see comments above regarding clarifications and address the comments below:

- There is mention of the national policy from 2009 to become carbon neutral by 2020, but there is information as to the progress to that goal, even though it is explained that the goal was diluted in 2015. Please clarify.

- Gender assessment presented belongs in the below.

- Overall there is a lot of useful information in this section, but it could benefit from being presented more clearly per the comments above. In addition, it would benefit from additional information regarding the existing institutional arrangements and coordination mechanisms related to energy, transport and air pollution, information on how the different modes of transport are used (bicycles, motorcycles, cars, buses,

maritime transport, commuting trends), any use of rideshare options and apps, the economic impact of fossil fuel imports and any existence of relevant subsidies, etc.

8/31/2020: Clarifications to the comments above have been provided. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

August 11 2020

From discussion with the Ministry of Environment: with regard to carbon neutrality policy, it is no longer maintained. However, Maldives has 10% emission reduction targets as stated in NDC as part of their Paris Agreement pledge: " In accordance with Decisions 1/CP.19 and 1/CP.20, Maldives communicates that it intends to reduce unconditionally 10% of its Greenhouse Gases (below BAU for the year 2030). and could be increased up to 24% in a conditional manner, in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by availability of financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building?

Gender Assessment in the baseline section was added to give information on the current situation in the base line, the detailed Gender implementation plan is present in the gender section

An analysis of implementation has not been presented as most of the policies and strategies have been developed or being developed, most of the outcomes have mostly been in terms of report and its implementation has been very limited. The only main outcome of these is introduction of duty exemption for electric vehicles, reduction in import duties for RE equipment. Presently there is not system in place to collect, investigate and monitor quantitative data on the interlinkage between urban emissions, climate change, health and economic costs to the society. As a results stakeholder lack the necessary tools and knowledge to make low investment initiatives.

The current mandate of the three key Ministries and departments (Energy Department, Environment Department and Maldives Transport Authority are described in the stakeholder section. Energy department is responsible for setting the energy related strategies and policies that govern the imports of fuels for use in economy and on electricity generation. The Maldives Transport Authority is responsible for transportation policies within the islands and connecting the islands. Ministry of Environment has the responsibility to address the air pollution issues, which include air pollution from transport sector. Though the energy, transport and air pollution policies and action impact each other there is no formal mechanism of a co-development of policies to ensure synergy and consistency among them.

Additional text has been included in the CEO document to further clarify the situation as suggested.

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

7/2/2020: Please address comments below:

- Component 2, Output 2.1 - Please consider carrying out an assessment as to whether e-Bikes would indeed be the best last-mile solution ahead of deciding to deploy this alternative, which has seen mixed success in other locations, or clarify if such an assessment has already been made.

9/1/2020: Ok. Cleared.

- Please clarify the ownership model for the e-Buses, e-Bikes and e-Boats, who will be responsible for repairs, operations and end-of-life disposal, and whether additional private sector financing is expected. If so, please consider adding as co-financing. In addition please clarify how sustainability will be incorporated in this component with regards to batteries.

9/1/2020: Ok. Cleared.

- There is very little information provided regarding the focus of e-boats. What type of boats would these be replacing, who are their users and existing business models, how will the project pursue an actual demonstration beyond the development of a feasibility study. Please clarify.

9/1/2020: Not cleared. Please add additional details under Outcome 2 on e-boats, which right now it is just one paragraph, while there is a lot more information on e-bikes and e-buses.

- Component 3 - please clarify the scale up strategy post-demonstration. What mechanisms will the project put in place to ensure uptake of the experience and support the development of a long-term scale up plan? Consider adding explicit output to support this (could be in Component 1 or 2 as well).

9/1/2020: Not cleared. Please consider how concretely the work under Component 1 to create an integrated transport master plan, national develop plan and e-mobility road map for the Male Region can be linked to the training under this component to support the implementation of the plans in other islands and identify technical and financial needs for scaling up with other sources (i.e. GCF).

- Component 3, Output 3.1- please consider incorporating assessment of health benefits including reduced mortality from a reduction in air pollution per STAPs comments.

9/1/2020: Ok, Cleared.

- Component 3 - there is no specific information as to which areas of the global thematic working groups and investment platforms this project will plan to benefit from.

9/1/2020: Not cleared. This comment was not addressed. Please include - it can also be added under section 1d. Child Project.

10/2/2020: Comments cleared.

Agency Response
September 17 2020

Additional information on e-boats has been added on page 30 and highlighted in yellow. There is very limited information available either with the government or in analysis and assessment undertaken through studies. Except for the boats operated by MTCC, a public enterprise, the boats are primarily operated by private owners. There is no subsidy of any nature provided by government to private operators. The business model is based on revenue generation from tickets sales. MTCC operated boats too recover operational costs through ticket revenue. The focus of e-boats is MTCC operated boats in initial phase and possibility of resort owners operated boats. Project will support MTCC in raising resources from bilateral donors as well as resources from the government. Discussions will be held with resort owners to explore the possibility of some of the resorts investing in e-boats for their operations as a pilot.

Scale up strategy ? The output 1 infact will be used as part of training in component 3 to enable scale up to other atolls and islands. A specific output is on training of officials from other atolls based on the output 1 to enable them develop roadmap for similar actions and projects in other atolls. Further the training of national policy makers too will work towards these ends. Please see the Output 3.3, the section is highlighted in yellow.

Links with global project ? we missed on highlighting in our last response that section on Child Project highlights the links with global project (page 43). A table is added in the section providing links to various global project components. The Maldives project will specifically benefit from e-battery disposal component of global project, as well as grid integration and renewable supply. Further the support and investment platform for Asia will be leveraged to seek further funding for scaling up actions.

August 11 2020

- The project implementation city (i.e. Greater Male) has a very limited land area (<5km radius). It is a highly dense city with very limited area under roads. The high number of motorcycles/ 2 wheelers in the City cause heavy traffic congestion. Given the short

distance and limited road infrastructure make walking and pedal bicycle are 2 best options of last mile connectivity for public transport. Furthermore, the Ministry of Transport is concerned to decongest the city streets and are reluctant to introduce any new form of vehicle. The project implementation phase will also undertake assessment of this scenario.

- For e-Buses, MTCC will be responsible. We have Ministry of Transport (MoT) co-finance and MTCC is an undertaking of MoT. Currently, most ICE boats are managed by Government (i.e. MTCC) and some of them are managed by private owners also. There are no e-Boats as of yet operating. For e-Bikes, during implementation phase of the project, it will be assessed, and tendering will be done.
- At this stage, e-Boats is not included in co-finance, currently project will undertake feasibility study which would help develop and seek funding for a pilot. Further, the information will be used to develop a Green Climate Fund (GCF) funding proposal to seek funding for scaling up investment for deployment of e-Boats. Primary interest in the e-boats has been expressed by MTCC. The project will also explore the interest of resorts and private owners in introducing e-boats.
- The Existing plan of the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of planning and infra and Ministry of transport is to utilize the project pilot in Greater Male as ? policy, demonstration and scale-up to other islands. Under component 3, authorities from other islands will be provided hands on training based on Male region experience to implement similar projects on their islands. Further, as the MoT is responsible for the planning and implementation of transport infrastructure, the scale up strategy focusses on building their capacity and enriching their experience to duplicate these efforts in the other islands. A key challenge is that the project has very limited resources and hence it is challenge to include additional outputs.

The project plans to introduce bike sharing through private sector involvement. A competitive bidding process is expected to be rolled out to engage private sector for the operation and maintenance of bikes. Also, the public transport buses that are to be procured under this project are planned to be maintained and run by a public company (MTCC/MPL)

- Maldives National University (MNU) is already doing work on air pollution and impact on health, along with Ministry of Health. The data from project MRV will be used by them to continue their work on assessment of health benefits including reduced mortality from a reduction in air pollution. Further, in Deliverable now specifically mentions assessment of health co-benefits, to avoid any ambiguity.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Based on the information provided, it appears that motorcycles have the highest concentration in the country, yet this sector is not directly targeted by the project. Please clarify.

8/31/2020: The below explanation is adequate. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

August 11 2020

The key strategy of the Ministry of Transport in Maldives is to reduce congestion on city roads, which is mainly due to high density of motorcycles/ 2W. Therefore, the focus is on to move towards combination of public transport and last mile connectivity with options pedal bikes and walking. Another key issue is the provision of charging infrastructure for 2W, which is expected to be catered during implementation phase under the support to Output 1.3 and 2.1

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

7/2/2020: Yes, however per comment above, please provide a description for the beneficiaries target provided.

9/1/2020: Not cleared yet.

10/2/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

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

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

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

7/2/2020: There is no information as to the stakeholders engaged during the design phase. Please clarify. In addition, there is reference made to UNEP also executing the project, which is not in line with GEF guidelines please change the language.

8/31/2020: Information on stakeholder consultations during design phase has been provided. This comment cleared.

Section describing implementation and execution has been revised to: *The successful implementation of this project relies on the leadership of the MEE and Ministry of Transport who will implement the project. MEE will be the executing agency of the project, and Ministry of Transport will co-execute the project across all project*

components, particularly in Components 1 and 2. UNEP will also carry out monitoring and evaluation of the project.

Please clarify this with the response provided below. Nowhere else in this submission does it say that UNEP will execute a portion of the project, including the budget. If UNEP intends to execute a portion of the project, this needs to be clearly stated throughout the document including the budget and a strong justification provided for it to be considered.

10/2/2020: This comment has not yet been clarified.

11/20/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

October 15 2020

Regrets for the oversight in missing the above comment in the last round and not responding. After discussions with Executing Entity it was agreed that UNEP will not have any role in the execution. Thus there are no funds allocated for execution related activities for UNEP and no role under this specific child project for the Air Quality Mobility Unit, UNEP.

August 11 2020

Stakeholder were consulted both at the initiation of the project development and a validation workshop was held before finalizing the project document. These details are included stakeholder engagement in stakeholder section.

The execution of the project will be by MoE which will be host the PMU. UNEP will provide technical assistance in terms of helping finalize TORs, reviewing the outputs and helping ensure quality of the outputs. Our experience from Low Island Strategy GEF 5 project is that it is difficult to find Project Managers with sufficient expertise in the relevant sectors. This slows the progress of project execution. Maldives is challenged because of its small size in having wide ranging expertise on sustainable transport that will be required. Thus the UNEP Air Quality and Mobility Unit will provide technical support to the PMU. The fund allocated is about 1% of the total budget but this small amount will help improve quality and speed of execution.

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

7/2/2020: A gender analysis has been carried out and gender considerations are integrated in the project design. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

7/2/2020: Yes, although additional information on how potential financial institutions would be engaged could be added.

8/31/2020: The national banking sector will be engaged. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

August 11 2020

(Quote from Ministry of Environment)

The financial institution in the Maldives is very small and mostly finances residential and commercial sector loans. Most of the public financing is either down through government budget, international multilateral financing institution, or loans from other national governments. The key focus of e-vehicle investment in public transport e-buses and e-boats. The e-bike system may be operated by private sector actor. International multilateral funds and funding agencies like GCF would be approached for financing subsequent investments to expand the e-vehicle usage. The scope of financing for e-vehicles in expansion of e-bikes and personnel and commercial purchase of Electric 2-Wheelers in the countries. The National Banking sector will be engaged in the awareness raising and capacity building activities to make them aware of the various aspects of e-vehicle technology.

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

7/2/2020: Please add climate change risks.

8/31/2020: Key climate risks are identified; however, there is no information as to how climate risks might impact this project and specific measures to manage that risk at the project level. Please revise and address the following questions per STAP guidance:

- (i) How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?
- (ii) Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?
- (iii) Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?
- (iv) What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

10/2/2020: This comment has not yet been completely addressed.

11/20/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

December 15, 2020,

Additional information on the Impacts of risk on project implementation as well as the Covid Risk Assessment have been provided in this Risk Section.

October 15 2020

The project objective is to promote sustainable transport infrastructure through policy and regulatory framework changes and pilot projects for promoting use of e-mobility based on public and non-motorized transport infrastructure. The transport infrastructure of the project is as vulnerable as any other infrastructure of the built environment. As mentioned in analysis the key risks are from sea level risk, flooding and sea surges. The solution to addressing these risks are not specific to transport infrastructure but to all the built environment. As described in the climate risk assessment, GoM has put in place a number of policies and strategies to address climate change risk and risk reduction. Further the policy framework guides the consideration of climate risk integration in infrastructure design and implementation. Thus the outputs and pilots of the project will be developed as per the climate and disaster risk reduction policies and strategies outlined by the Government. Further in developing the project outputs and pilots the

climate risk screen will be used to identify specific aspects that can be addressed at the specific transport project level. This has been included in the TORs for all the relevant outputs, viz, National E-mobility plan, Transport plan for Male, and the pilots on e-bikes, e-buses and e-boats.

The climate risk assessment has been revised to clearly identify the climate risks and the framework of the government in addressing these climate risks. Further, a line in the Risk table has been added for Climate Risk with the mitigation measures mentioned.

August 11 2020

Done.

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

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

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

7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

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

7/2/2020: Yes, however, we note that the terminal evaluation in the budget is placed under the PMC, when it should be in the M&E budget outside of the PMC. Please change.

8/31/2020: M&E budget has been separated. Please also include a Table in M&E section on the portal outlining the different M&E activities and associated budget.

10/2/2020: Comment not yet addressed.

1/5/2021: Thank you for separating the M&E budget from the PMC in Annex J of the endorsement document; however, the information is now inconsistent with what is presented in Table B in the Portal Endorsement Request entry, where PMC is still listed as \$163,000. In addition, the costs associated with the National Technical Coordinator (which is part of the Project Management Unit associated with the project's execution) are meant to be paid by the PMC, not by the M&E budget.

Therefore, we recommend to separate the M&E budget as \$35,000 to cover the cost of the Terminal Evaluation from the PMC budget which will now amount to \$128,000 per GEF policies. This means that Table B should be updated with an additional M&E component for \$35,000 (make sure to fill out the whole entry including financing type, expected outcome and output); the budget in Annex J should be updated to match Table B; and the M&E budget in the Portal should only include the TE (or specify that the time from the NTC is part of the execution costs and thus paid by the PMC).

1/12/2021: This has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response
October 05 2020

The table for M&E activities and associated budget has been included in the Annex J of the endorsement document. The key costs of M&E are in two categories (a) The preparation of various monitoring reports ? this is the responsibility of the National Technical Coordinator (NTC), who also acts as the Project Manager, and is included as the time cost of NTC. Approximately 10% of the NTC's time is estimated to be for

preparing the monitoring reports; and, (b) Terminal evaluation. As suggested a summary table (based on Annex J) has been included in the section.

January 08 2021

The Changes have been made as suggested.

August 11 2020

Updated in revised CEO document

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

7/2/2020: These are described, however please consider incorporating them in the project to assess the socioeconomic benefits of the project were possible.

Agency Response

December 15, 2020

Additional information on COVID Response Benefits has been added to this section.

August 11 2020

The assessment will be included in the surveys as well as the KPIs for monitoring the air pollution issues. The respective ToRs have been updated in the document

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: The project has been assessed as having moderate risk in the submitted ESS screening. Please fill out the Environmental and Social Safeguard Risks section in the portal.

8/31/2020: Comment not cleared. Please add summary of measures to address identified risks on the Portal section highlighted in yellow below:

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.



Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
Maldives EV ESERN	CEO Endorsement ESS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

10/2/2020: Comment not yet addressed.

11/20/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response
October 5 2020

Brief summary of measures added to the ?Measures to address identified Risks and Impacts? component of the Portal.

August 11 2020

The ESERN is attached in the submission.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/2/2020: Project results framework included in Project Document. Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2020: Please take a look at Council comments and respond to whichever are relevant to this child project.

8/31/2020: Thank you for providing the answers below. As these are not included in Annex B, could you please copy them into the Portal section Annex B:

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Annex B attached.

10/2/2020: The answers were not yet added onto the Portal section illustrated above. Please copy-paste onto portal.

11/20/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Detailed response to comments are included in separate pdf files as follows:

Annex B.1 ? Responses to GEF Sec reviews (on the PFD)

Annex B.2 ? Responses to GEF Sec reviews (on the PFD addendum)

Annex B.3 ? Responses to STAP comments

Annex B.4 ? Responses to Council comments?

A summary of the response based on the attached documents is provided in the Annex B section of the Portal.

September 17 2020

The comments from Council and members are added to Annex B

August 11 2020

There is no specific comments on Maldives project in the council comments. Two generic comment that are relevant were received from council members and are addressed in the project document:

- (i) Review of fossil fuel subsidies as well as consider implementation of emission taxes : Component 1 on the policy regulatory framework will undertake assessment of the fossil fuel subsidies, which are primarily for electricity generation on outer smaller islands, and potential of emission taxes.
- (ii) Consider environmental impacts of electric vehicles, particularly where facilities for managing batteries don't exist: Component 1 specifically includes development of framework for Maldives in re-use and environmental safe disposal of batteries.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Please take a look at STAP comments and respond to whichever are relevant to this child project.

8/31/2020: Not cleared. While the result of the STAP review was "concur" there are comments in the review that are relevant to all child projects and should have been taken into account during the design phase. Please find the review here: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10114_STAP_Screen.pdf

10/2/2020: Comment not yet addressed.

11/20/2020: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Detailed response to comments are included in separate pdf files as follows:

Annex B.1 ? Responses to GEF Sec reviews (on the PFD)

Annex B.2 ? Responses to GEF Sec reviews (on the PFD addendum)

Annex B.3 ? Responses to STAP comments

Annex B.4 ? Responses to Council comments?

A summary of the response based on the attached documents is provided in the Annex B section of the Portal.

August 11 2020

No comments were received from STAP on the E-vehicle programme.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/2/2020: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Term sheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2020: Please address comments.

8/31/2020: Please address remaining comments.

10/2/2020: Please look over the remaining comments as not all of them from the previous review were addressed.

11/20/2020: All comments above have been addressed.

In response to the ongoing COVID-19 Crisis, the GEF Secretariat is qualitatively and quantitatively tracking how considerations related to COVID-19 is being incorporated into projects' risk analysis and response measures, as well as opportunities to support COVID-19 response in the short and long-term. As the project does not reflect these considerations in any section, please add an assessment of the existing and potential COVID impacts to the project and appropriate response measures to the Risks section, as well as a summary of how the project may or may not impact the Maldives response to the socioeconomic impacts brought on by COVID (including for example, job

creation and training, local economic development, productivity improvements, improved access to essential services, public health benefits, etc. in the short term, and/or strengthened supply chains, consistent with long-term decarbonization targets, avoid lock-in of carbon or energy intensive infrastructure, increase natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity, protect natural capital, limit human-wildlife contact, etc. in the long-term). This last section could be added to the benefits section.

**12/17/2020: COVID risk assessment and opportunities analysis has been added.
This is cleared.**

Please address final comment regarding the M&E budget and PMC above.

1/12/2021: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/1/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/20/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/5/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

