



Transformation to Low/Zero Transport sector - Enabling uptake of Electric Mobility in Solomon Islands

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11079

Countries

Solomon Islands

Project Name

Transformation to Low/Zero Transport sector - Enabling uptake of Electric Mobility in Solomon Islands

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/24/2024

Review completed by PM

7/26/2024

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 10/08/2024:

2. Cleared.

EBF 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Our comment from 8/27/2024 is pending until a revised LOE is submitted.
3. Agency ID is no longer generated. Cleared.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. There is probably a mistake in the executing partner in the project information table. The reference to "Fiji" is probably out of place. Please amend.

GENERAL CHILD PROJECT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------|
| Parent Project Title: | Global Programme to Support Countries to Upscale Integrated Electric Mobility Systems | | |
| Child Project Title: | Transformation to Low/Zero Transport sector - Enabling uptake of Electric Mobility in Solomon Islands | | |
| Region: | Solomon Islands | GEF Project ID: | 11079 |
| Country(ies): | Solomon Islands | Type of Project: | MSP |
| GEF Agency(ies): | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Project Executing Entity(s): | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) of  | Project Executing Type: | Government |
| | Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) | | Others |

- Please ensure consistency regarding the project's executing partners. The LOE mentions the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), while the institutional arrangements section and the project information table mention MECDM and the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) as executing partners. The budget table only mentions GGGI. Please correct in the LOE, institutional arrangement section, budget table, and project information table as appropriate.
- Please include the GEF Agency Project ID in the Portal if available.

Agency Response

Response 08/10/2024

A new LOE is attached.

Response30/09/2024

- Thanks for highlighting the oversight. It has been addressed.
- A LOE is requested to include GGGI as a Executing partner. Also the LOE will address the footnote 1. We expect the LOE to be issued within this week. We will upload it as soon as received.
- UNEP doesn't generated the ID anymore, the reason why it is not provided.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Component 2 addresses climate change adaptation. Please consider updating the Adaption Rio Marker so it is consistent with the interventions under this component.

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. The marker is changed to 1.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please include a link with the parent program goal and approach

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. A short paragraph indicating the project is under GP has been added.

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 10/08/2024:

2. GEF funding (10%) and the co-finance (10%) contributions to PMC are now proportional. Cleared.

EBF 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared
2. We thank you for the correction. Please adjust the GEF funding (10%) and/or the co-finance (7.9%) contributions to PMC, so they are proportional, in accordance with the Council decision GEF/C.39.
3. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Component 3 has been divided into investment and technical assistance activities. While this distinction is welcomed, kindly note that they share the same output. Please clarify whether this is correct, as our understanding is that the final outputs shall be different.

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|---|-----|------------|------------|
| Component 3: Design and delivery of a pilot project of Electric Vehicle technology. | Technical Assistance | Outcome 3: Increased availability of financing for EVs accelerates the shift to EVs fleet owners. | Output 3: EV pilot implemented to demonstrate the technical and financial viability and scale-up strategy developed. | GET | 391,696.00 | 130,000.00 |
| Component 3: Design and delivery of a pilot project of Electric Vehicle technology. | Investment | Outcome 3: Increased availability of financing for EVs accelerates the shift to EVs fleet owners. | Output 3: EV pilot implemented to demonstrate the technical and financial viability and scale-up strategy developed. | GET | 345,000.00 | 570,000.00 |

2. The PMC contribution from GEF project financing is 10%, but the co-financing contribution is very low (1.2%). Please amend this by increasing the co-financing portion and/or reducing the GEF portion so that they are proportional.
3. There is a one-dollar difference between the M&E section of the project description overview and the M&E section of the budget table. Please request amend.

| Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) ⓘ | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|-----|-----------|
| M&E | Technical Assistance | Outcome 5: The project is effectively monitored and evaluated. | Output 5.1: Monitoring and evaluation products are delivered. | GET | 82,290.00 |
| \$ 1,542,710 | | \$ 82,289 | | \$ | |

Agency Response

Response 08/10/2024

The Co-finance PMC is made 10%

Response30/09/2024

1. Outcome 3 is split into two outputs (feasibility study and design, and implementation of pilot). This is reflected in the table as well as in the rest of the documentation.
2. The error in PMC cofinance reporting is regreted. The PMC co-finance amount is 941,302, which is about 8% of the co-finance.
3. The difference in M&E budget is corrected. This was caused due to rounding off error.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Thank you for including the figures and tables. Cleared.
2. Noted. Cleared.
3. Regarding baseline and ongoing projects:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please include all Figures and tables in the CEO Endorsement document since this is the document that is circulated and reviewed by the GEF Council members and it is web posted. In case of need for assistance, please instruct the agency to contact ITS at the email ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org.
2. Is it correct that only 2 buses are registered in the Solomon Islands? Please explain the steep increase by 2050.

Table 1: Projected increase in registered vehicles by type in the Solomon Islands

| Total Registered Vehicles | 2021 | Projection 2030 | Projection 2050 (from CAGR) | Ajs. Projection 2030* | Ajs. Projection 2050* |
|---------------------------|------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Buses | 2 | 2 | 3 | 436 | 85 |

3. Regarding baseline and ongoing projects:
 1. The GEF-funded ISLANDS Pacific Project is mentioned earlier in the document, please ensure it is captured in this section and in the corresponding table.
 2. It seems the project will build on two CTCN-funded projects, i.e., the National Electric Mobility Policy and the [Policy Roadmap for E-Mobility](#) (more information [in this link](#)). This collaboration is important for the GEF in the context of the technology discussions at the UNFCCC, so please make sure this is well-reflected and documented in the proposal.
 3. We couldn't find the project "Facilitation of the achievement of increased access to electricity in rural communities in the Solomon Islands" in our portal. Are you referring to project GEF ID 9787 "Stimulating Progress towards Improved Rural Electrification in the Solomons (SPIRES)" implemented by UNDP? If so, please correct.
4. After describing the project rationale and before the project description, the agency unintentionally left several internal comments that should be removed.

Agency Response
Response30/09/2024

1. All the figures are now included. This aspect has been quite challenging, and the portal needs to be looked at.
2. Yes, that is correct there are only 2 buses. The projected numbers are from the model to forecast the uptake as published in the CTCN-funded study outputs: The adjusted projections for 2030 is on the basis of an assumption that public transport will take a significant portion of future travel demand and at least 25% of the population will travel using public transport. This assumption takes into account the current car ownership and also the future car ownership, where a steep increase was estimated. The first three columns are projected using CAGR growth of population, as accurate vehicle data was not available. The number is low as current numbers are also very low therefore if growth in number buses happens in a BAU scenario, there will be only 3 buses. The study assumes that the Solomon Islands would like to have sufficient number of buses which is reflected in the adjusted projection numbers.
3. Baseline and ongoing projects:
 1. The reference to ISLAND project has been included in the Baseline table.
 2. The CTCN projects are included in the baseline section. The outputs on policies and other actions being proposed under the project are based on the recommendations made in the policy and roadmap prepared under the project.
 3. Yes the full expansion of SPIRES is not added. The "Facilitation" Is the project description.
4. Thanks for highlighting the internal comments. These have been removed.

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 10/07/2024:

- 1. Cleared
- 2. Cleared
- 3. Noted. Cleared
- 4. Cleared
- 5. Component 1:
 - 1. Noted. Cleared
 - 2. Cleared
 - 3. Noted. Cleared
 - 4. Cleared
- 6. Component 3:
 - 1. Cleared
 - 2. Cleared
 - 3. Cleared
- 7. Text added. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

- 1. [General comment] This section has a different font size than the rest of the proposal. Please amend.
- 2. [General comment] Please include all Figures and tables in the CEO Endorsement document since this is the document that is circulated and reviewed by the GEF Council members and it is web posted. In case of need for assistance, please instruct the agency to contact ITS at the email ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org.
- 3. [General comment] Given that electricity access is low, there are grid constraints, and electricity tariffs are among the highest in the region -- as mentioned in the

- barriers section. How does the project plan to address these barriers to promote and scaleup electric mobility? Please explain and reflect this in the project description.
4. The Theory of Change is referred to in the text but is not visible in the document. Please correct.
 5. Regarding Component 1:
 1. [General comment] Should the project consider assessing the impact of electric vehicles on the grid and provide recommendations to optimize their integration with the grid? Please explain.
 2. Regarding Output 1.1, 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.
 3. Output 1.2 focuses on EV and EV supply equipment standards. Given the lack of standards for ICE vehicles and policies for End-of-Life-Vehicles and batteries (ELV) -- identified in the barriers section. Should the project also consider addressing fuel or efficiency standards for these vehicles, ELV, and/or other regulations to hinder the import of highly inefficient vehicles or second-hand vehicles beyond their lifespan?
 4. Regarding Deliverables 1.3.4 and 2.1.5., both deliverables focus on ?Support the adoption?. These are not a tangible deliverables. Please consider renaming them.
 6. Regarding Component 3:
 1. As part of the technical and market challenges, it is mentioned that "there are only three major dealers [of vehicles] in the country." Moreover, it is mentioned that "One of the major challenges in automobile sector in the Solomon Islands, is having limited local capacity and skills for repair and maintenance (R&M) services which are limited and may not be available for EVs." Please explain how the project will address these barriers to deploy a demonstration project under Component 3.
 2. A Technical Working Group (TWG) for pilots is mentioned in the institutional arrangements section. Does it refer to activities under this component? If so, please briefly mention it in this section. We welcome the establishment of such TWG to promote integrated planning and deployment of the demonstrations with as many relevant stakeholders as possible.

3. The following text ("*Gender action 3...*") looks like an extract. Please review and correct:

- **Deliverable 3.1.1:** Feasibility Study for EV Pilot
- **Deliverable 3.1.2:** Pilot Project Design and Monitoring Plan
- **Deliverable 3.1.3:** Implementation of Pilot Project
- **Deliverable 3.1.4:** Training for Drivers and Maintenance Staff
- **Deliverable 3.1.6:** Outreach and Engagement Materials
- **Deliverable 3.1.7:** Pilot Evaluation and Lessons Learned
- **Deliverable 3.1.8:** EV Fleet Upscaling Roadmaps for i) SIPA and ii) Government Fleet

Gender action 3: Provide targeted training for female drivers and technicians.

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.

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. The fonts were reviewed and addressed in all sections.
2. Figures and tables are included.
3. As mentioned in the baseline, a number of projects and efforts are ongoing in strengthening the grid, access to electricity, and increasing the share of the RE. Therefore, the project will not address this barrier.
4. TOC is added to
5. Component 1

1. The project has integrated the consideration of impact of EV on grid in output
2. Development of SUMP will include the assessment of impact of EV use as well as recommendation to address it including RE based stand alone charging stations. This aspect is also included in the pilot design under output 3.

2. Output 1.1 comment on Institutional arrangement addressed. The platform is a coordination mechanism and will be owned and established at the MECDM. It will be supported by Project PMU during project duration.

3. Output 1.2 will address the vehicle emission standard for ICEs. As well as the develop standards for EVs will be current and future electricity grid infrastructure.

4. The language has been revised. The intent is support the ministry in preparing the necessary documentation for its submission to the government for consideration as well as response to comments received in the process.

6. Component 3

1. The project during PPG already consulted with the existing dealers. These dealers will be engaged in the design of pilot and in import of the vehicles. Pilot drivers and maintenance staff will be training to operate and service the vehicles. This is included in the Deliverables.

2. The reference is included to TWG in Output 3.

3. Each output lists the gender action identified for the output. Gender Action 3: refers to training of female drivers and technicians as the gender action plan. This has been integrated with the deliverable.

7. Socio Economic Benefits have been further elaborated in the CEO Doc.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Noted. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please include all Figures and tables in the CEO Endorsement document since this is the document that is circulated and reviewed by the GEF Council members and it is

web posted. In case of need for assistance, please instruct the agency to contact ITS at the email ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org.

2. Please ensure consistency regarding the project's executing partners. The LOE mentions the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), while the institutional arrangements section and the project information table mention MECDM and the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) as executing partners. The budget table only mentions GGGI. Please correct in the LOE, institutional arrangement section, budget table, and project information table as appropriate.
3. 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).
4. Please delete the duplicate text being entered in the Institutional Arrangement section in the Portal.

Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Please describe the Institutional Arrangements for the execution of this child project, including framework and mechanism for coordination, governance, financial management and procurement. This should include consideration for linking with relevant initiatives at country-level (if a country child project) or regional/global level (for coordination platform child project). If possible, please summarize the flow of funds (diagram), accountabilities for project management and financial reporting (organogram), including audit, and staffing plans. (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

B.4 Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Please describe the Institutional Arrangements for the execution of this child project, including framework and mechanism for management and procurement. If possible, please summarize the flow of funds (diagram), accountabilities for project management and financial reporting (organogram), including audit, and staffing plans. (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

1. Figures and Tables are included in the CEO doc.
2. MECDM is the Government agency that will lead on the project execution and be responsible for the project. It had identified GGGI as its partner, which will provide, both, fund management as well as technical expertise. The project will establish a PMU at the ministry that will work closely with the NPD. This is reflected in the section. A new LOE is being prepared for project reflecting the role of GGGI.
3. This has been addressed as mentioned above section.
4. The repeated text has been deleted.

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 10/08/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF 10/07/2024:

1. Thank you for sharing the Excel worksheet. It is interesting to see the differences between the projects in Fiji, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. If possible, briefly explain why the ratio of GEF investment (USD) versus tCO₂ reduced is not as good in Solomon Island as in the rest of the countries.
2. Please correct the total tCO₂e reduced by the project in the summary section (321,526 tCO₂e) so it is consistent with the Core Indicators section (233,117 tCO₂). Also, correct indirect tCO₂ emissions reduced (currently, 71,123 instead of 72,714 tCO₂e) in the "end of project target" in the Project Results Framework -- it doesn't coincide with the Core Indicators section nor the Excel worksheet.

Extract from the Project Summary:

This project will support the development of an enabling environment for introduction and upscaling of e-mobility. This will help catalyze the shift towards net zero by 2050, in line with the national ambitions of the Solomon Islands. It is anticipated that this project will directly through pilot and indirectly through other deliverables mitigate **321,526 metric tons of CO₂e** and benefit 810 people directly.

Extract from the Core Indicators:

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

| Total Target Benefit | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at End of Project) |
|--|----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct) | 19358 | 72714 | 0 | 0 |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect) | 40101 | 160403 | 0 | 0 |

Extract from the Project Results Framework:

| Objective | Indicator | Baseline | Mid-term target | End of project target | Means of verification | Assumptions & Risks (see section 5) |
|--|--|----------|-----------------|---|---|--|
| The objective of this project is to accelerate the introduction of electric mobility in the Solomon Islands to reduce land transport sector emissions. | Cumulative GHG emissions reduction from road transport from business as usual (MtCO ₂ e). | 0 | 0 | 233,426 tCO ₂ e Direct: 71,123 Indirect: 160,403 | Final Project Report. Assessment of Pilot implementation Indirect will be estimated based on model and data collection at the end of project. | |
| | Direct beneficiaries of the project disaggregated by gender. | 0 | 0 | Women: 450 Men: 350 | Project Reports (Workshop Reports, Etc). End of the project survey | |

3. Thank you for the explanation. Cleared.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please provide the GHG spreadsheet so the GEF team can review the calculations and assumptions made.
2. There is a mismatch in the GHG reductions between the CEO Endorsement document, i.e., 321,526 tCO₂eq, and the Core Indicators section, i.e., 231,526 tCO₂eq. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

3. According to the LT-LEDS, the country has the potential to reduce emissions by up to 253,000 tCO₂eq by 2050. So, are all or most of the emissions expected to be mitigated by the project in a 20-year period? Please clarify the numbers and explain.

Agency Response

Response 08/10/2024

1) The GEF investment per unit of GHG emissions is lower for Solomon Islands (SI) mainly because the emissions reductions (Secondary direct and indirect) in Solomon Island are lower compared to other two countries. This is mainly because of the vehicle population being much lower in SI than other two countries. This is primarily due to a very low vehicle ownership, which is not expected to grow very strongly. It is about 25% of Vanuatu and 10% of Fiji. This is the main underlying factor.

2) The GHG reduction figures have been made consistent across the document as highlighted.

Response30/09/2024

1. GHG spreadsheet is included in the files. Please note that the sheet includes calculation for all country projects using common methodology given by Global Programme. Each country is separately reflected in the sheets.
2. The error has been corrected.
3. The 253,000 tCO₂eq by 2050 mentioned in the LT-LEDS refers to the transport sector's emissions reduction potential, primarily through electric vehicle introduction and efficiency improvements. The project's estimated 233,117 tCO₂eq reduction by 2040 represents a significant portion of this sector-specific goal, not the country's entire emissions reduction target. It's important to note that the project's reductions will continue to accumulate beyond 2040 as EV adoption increases and the grid further decarbonizes, contributing to the 2050 target. The project's mitigation potential, while substantial, is proportional to and aligned with the national transport sector goal, not exceeding it.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Under the Overall Risk category, please provide a summary that helps understand the identified rating.
2. Mitigation measures for each risk category are mentioned, but the risk itself is not. Please elaborate on this section further.

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. Overall Risk assessment is provided.
2. Risks are included for each category.

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 RequestN/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 RequestEBF 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 RequestEBF 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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 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 Request

EBF 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. We note that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) (Annex F). SRIF says "Carry out further assessments (e.g., site visits, experts' inputs, consult affected communities, etc.)? However, it is not clear how further assessments will be carried out.
 1. Please elaborate further on how this assessment will take place including budget, timeline, and responsibility. In addition, the project's overall ESS risk classification is low in the Portal.
 2. Please make this risk consistent with SRIF and revise. Also, the environmental and social risk section of the Key risk table in the Portal is low.

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. The risk is identified from the disposal of End of Life Vehicles and EV batteries will require appropriate E&S assessments and plans of sites handling these wastes to mitigate negative impacts. This is with respect to the pilot vehicles. The project itself under Output 1.3 address the issue of ELV and battery disposal. This will put in place the required regulations for safe disposal of the waste. The solution in conjunction with the ISLANDs project, which is working on ELV too, will be on finding ways of creating disposal of these vehicles and batteries in other countries given the small nature of market. Further, the regulations will include procedures for design and operation of temporary storage sites.
2. The E&S risk in Portal and SRIF is aligned. The risk in SRIF is with regards to E&S and though medium the overall risk of the project remains low, as explained in the overall risk column.

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 Request
EBF 8/27/2024:

Cleared

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 Request N/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 10/07/2024:

1. "Contingency" has been replaced for "Travel". Cleared.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please use the eligible categories included in the Guidelines. ?Contingency? is not a valid category.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANTS (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 |
| Expert Costs for Project Development | 41,600.00 | 41,600.00 |
| Workshops | 4,400.00 | 4,400.00 |
| Contingency | 2,362.00 | 2,362.00 |
| Total | 48,362.00 | 48,362.00 |

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. The funds were used for travel for final validation of the expert. This has been accordingly reflected.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. The USD 30,000 in-kind contribution and USD 45,000 in Public Investment do not match the amounts listed in the co-financing letter (USD 35,000 and USD 40,000, respectively). Please update either the co-financing letter or the GEF Portal to ensure consistency.
2. The USD 1 million JICA grant is currently categorized under Recurrent Expenditures. Typically, grants are considered Investment Mobilizations according to the GEF Co-financing Policy. Moreover, these contributions seem more like in-kind, given that they support advisory services. Please update the Portal or the letter to correctly categorize this as either in-kind (Recurrent Expenditures) or grants (Investment Mobilizations). Additionally, please include the conversion rate from JPY to USD along with the source and date (e.g., UN Treasury Operational Exchange Rate).

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

1. The mistake has been corrected in the portal in line with the Co-finance letter.
2. The JICA grant is financing for an experts to be located in the ministry to help with the sustainable transport and Renewable energy work. These experts will work on development of sustainable transportation plan. Thus it is grant in terms of human resources. The portal reflects now as in-kind (recurrent expenditure).

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 RequestEBF 8/27/2024: Mr. Chanel Iroi, Operational Focal Point, OFP of Solomon Islands since 2013-10-02, signed the LOE. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 8/27/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 10/08/2024:

1. The footnote is included in the new LOE. Cleared.

EBF 10/07/2024:

1. Our comment from 8/27/2024 is pending until a revised LOE is submitted.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. The following footnote, which is contained in the GEF-8 LOE template, is missing. Please provide a new LOE or request the OFP to acknowledge this footnote via email and attach the communication to the documents section.

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

Agency Response

Response 08/10/2024

A new LOE is attached.

Response 30/09/2024

A new LOE is being prepared. This will be uploaded as soon as received. We expect to receive it within week of October the first.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Annex C added to the portal form. Cleared.

EBF 8/27/2024:

1. Please include Annex C in the CEO Endorsement document since this is the document that is circulated and reviewed by the GEF Council members and it is web posted. In case of need for assistance, please instruct the agency to contact ITS at the email ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org.

Agency Response

Response30/09/2024

2. Annex C is included.

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 10/07/2024:

1. **The GEO Name ID in the portal form appears blank, please ensure it is filled out correctly.**

ANNEX E: PROJECT MAP AND COORDINATES

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place

| Location Name | Latitude | Longitude | Geo Name ID | Loca Ac Desc |
|---------------|----------|-----------|-------------|--------------------|
| Honiara | -9.43 | 159.95 | | |

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

1) This has been addressed.

Response30/09/2024

The GeoName ID has been updated.

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 10/07/2024:

1. Noted. Cleared.
2. Cleared
3. A new budget table has been uploaded to address previous issue. 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.
2. Please ensure consistency regarding the project's executing partners. The LOE mentions the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), while the institutional arrangements section and the project information table mention MECDM and the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) as executing partners. The budget table only mentions GGGI. Please correct in the LOE, institutional arrangement section, budget table, and project information table as appropriate.
3. Additionally, the budget table in the portal view and the attached document contain line descriptions that are cut. Please amend and provide clear and

complete detailed descriptions of the budget categories.

| Annex G: GEF Format Budget | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|----|
| GEF budget category & detailed description | Component 1 | Component 2 | Component 3 | |
| | Outcome 1 | Outcome 2 | Outcome 3 | |
| 02. Goods | | \$ 500 | \$ 500 | |
| Printouts under Component 2 (SUMP Communication Campaign Material) | | \$ 500 | | |
| Printouts under Component 3 (Pilot Project Dissemination and Training) | | | \$ 500 | |
| 04. Grants/Subgrants | | | \$ 345,000 | |
| Grant for the incremental cost of EV Pilot | | | \$ 345,000 | |
| 07. Contractual services (company) | \$ 254,060 | \$ 115,030 | \$ 185,000 | \$ |
| Minimum standard documentation for the import of EV and Charging Station | \$ 85,000 | | | |
| Battery EOL Management: Assessment Report of the current policy framework | \$ 84,030 | | | |
| Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan | | \$ 115,030 | | |
| Baseline measurement of project outcome indicators, GEF Core indicators (| | | | |
| End-point measurement of project outcome indicators, GEF Core indicators | | | | |
| Charging Tariffs and Incentives Development | \$ 85,030 | | | |
| Pilot FS and Implementation Design/Monitoring Plan | | | \$ 85,000 | |
| Pilot Implementation technical support, Trainings and Outreach Engagemer | | | \$ 80,000 | |
| Pilot Evaluation for Upscaling | | | \$ 20,000 | |
| Gender and Decarbonization Knowledge Product and Training | | | | \$ |
| 09. International Consultants | \$ 24,750 | | | \$ |
| External Evaluation Expert | | | | |
| Capacity Assessment and Training Consultant | \$ 24,750 | | | |
| Consultant for Training for Regulators | | | | \$ |
| 10. Local Consultants | | | | |
| Assistant Project Manager | | | | |
| 11. Salary and benefits/Staff Costs | \$ 173,369 | \$ 51,403 | \$ 196,196 | \$ |
| Chief Technical Advisor (GGGI) | \$ 57,197 | \$ 37,988 | \$ 99,687 | \$ |
| Finance and Administration Associate (GGGI) | | | | |
| Project Management Support (GGGI) | | | | |
| MEL Specialist (GGGI) | | | | |
| Senior Economist (GGGI) | | | \$ 34,750 | |
| Gender Expert (GGGI) | \$ 4,268.21 | \$ 9,616.98 | | \$ |
| Communications Expert (GGGI) | \$ 5,969.76 | \$ 3,798.94 | \$ 5,969.76 | \$ |
| Solomon Islands Country Representative (GGGI) | \$ 15,407.56 | | | |
| Legal Expert | | | \$ 30,255.70 | |
| Sustainable Transport Officer (GGGI) | \$ 90,526.41 | | \$ 25,533.09 | \$ |
| 12. Training, Workshops, Meetings | \$ 31,500.00 | \$ 11,700.00 | \$ 3,000.00 | \$ |
| Workshops, Trainings, Meetings under Component 1 | \$ 31,500.00 | | | |
| Workshops, Trainings, Meetings under Component 2 | | \$ 11,700.00 | | |
| Workshops, Trainings, Meetings under Component 3 | | | \$ 3,000.00 | |
| Workshops, Trainings, Meetings under Component 4 | | | | \$ |
| 13. Travel | \$ 52,339.00 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ 7,000.00 | \$ |
| Travel cost for missions to Honiara (Component 1) | \$ 12,339.00 | | | |
| Travel cost for missions to Honiara (Component 2) | | \$ 5,000.00 | | |
| Travel cost for missions to Honiara (Component 3) | | | \$ 7,000.00 | |
| Travel cost for missions to Honiara (Component 4) | | | | \$ |
| Travel cost for participation in global project capacity building and awarene | \$ 40,000.00 | | | |
| 15. Other operating costs | \$ 5,800.00 | | | |
| Contingency for Contracts in currencies other than US\$ | \$ 5,800.00 | | | |
| Grand Total | \$ 541,818 | \$ 183,633 | \$ 736,696 | \$ |

Agency Response
Response30/09/2024

1. The Assist PM will be responsible for the day to day execution of project, including planning, organizing meetings and events, follow up on the project reports, reporting to the IA, conducting PSC meetings etc. This person will be based at the Ministry. The Proj Management Support is the function GGGI will undertake as support provider for finance management to support overall timeliness and quality of project, procurement as well as appropriate reporting.
2. As explained in Institutional arrangement section, GGGI will provide financial management as well as technical support.
3. New Budget document is included with all the lines clearly readable.

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 RequestN/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 10/08/2024: The PM recommends the project for further processing.

EBF 10/07/2024: Please address the comments above 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.

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 10/08/2024: Cleared

EBF 8/27/2024: On Annex I: Responses to project reviews: Please include the responses in the designated field in the Portal view (which is the document that is circulated and web posted).

ANNEX I: 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.

Responses to the project review are included in Annex M in the attached CEO ER document.

9.3 Review Dates

| | CEO Approval | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---------------------|---|
| First Review | 8/27/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 10/7/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 10/8/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |