

Integrated, Sustainable and Low Emissions Transport in Cote d'Ivoire

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10302

Countries

Cote d'Ivoire

Project Name

Integrated, Sustainable and Low Emissions Transport in Cote d'Ivoire

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

11/30/2020

Review completed by PM

4/14/2021

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

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

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12.21 - FB

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project remains well aligned with the relevant focal area elements, particularly CCM 1-2.

However, please note the following comment:

1. "other executing partners" should list both MINEDD and MOT as MOT will be executing part of the project.

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The Ministry of Transport (MOT) has been added as another executing partner on the Portal.

Note: for ease of reference, all edits have been highlighted in yellow in the updated PDF version of the Cote d'Ivoire e-mobility project CEO Endorsement Document uploaded on the ?Documents? section of the GEF portal.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project structure appears broadly appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes as presented in table B.

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

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/29/2021, FB: all PPO comments are cleared.

04/19/2021: Additional comments from GEF PPO:

PPO has reviewed this child MSP and below are our comments:

1. PMC is not proportionate between GEF funding and co-financing:

Sub Total	371,566.00	5,537,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)		
GET	37,150.00	150,000.00
Sub Total(\$)	37,150.00	150,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)	408,716.00	5,687,000.00
	10.00%	2.71%

Please explore with the Agency the possibility to raise co-financing PMC to share the burden of the cost for the Chief Technical Advisor which are currently spread among project component budget and PMC.

2. Co-financing: Co-financing letter from Ministry of Transport (MOT) indicates ?public investment? co-financing (and not grant). Please revise table C accordingly.

rev. 04/12/2021, FB:

1. cleared.
2. cleared.
3. cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

1. All co-financing letters obtained in a language other than English should be accompanied by a translation in English. We do not need an official/notarized translation, a simple office translation by the agency will suffice. Please provide it in the document section.
2. Please clarify the status of the first loss guarantee funding to be provided by IFC and whether these should be considered as co-financing. This is mentioned in the investment mobilized explanation, but it is not included in Table C, so it is confusing.
3. the cofinancing budget included in table C and in the detailed budget in Annex I-2 have inconsistencies which need to be fixed, see table snapshot below:

ANNEX I-2 DETAILED CO-FINANCE BUDGET

No.	Co-finance partner		Nature of co-finance		Co-finance contribution per project Component in US\$					Total in US\$		
	Name	Source	Type	Investment Mobilized	C1	C2	C3	C4	PMC			
1	Ministry of Transport	Recipient Country Government	Grant	Recurrent expenditures		5,000,000					5,000,000	Supp (Outp reimbr is fina mana electri
2	Ministry of Transport	Recipient Country Government	Grant	Investment mobilized		190,000					190,000	Feasit along (Outp
3	Ministry of Transport	Recipient Country Government	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	15,000	30,000	30,000	5,000	20,000		100,000	Partic imple betwe
4	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Recipient Country Government	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	50,000	35,000	35,000	82,000	100,000		302,000	Techn Accou
5	Ministry of Petroleum, Energy and Renewable Energies	Recipient Country Government	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000		50,000	Partic compr GEF p
6	UNEP	GEF Agency	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	20,000		45,000	Supp such the pr Nation of the
Total					85,000	5,270,000	80,000	102,000	150,000		5,687,000	

Agency Response

28 April 2021

1. Based on the 1st part of the comment, we understand that PPO is expecting that we reach a PMC co-finance close to 10% of the total co-finance, which would be around US\$ 550,000 of PMC. However, given that the project only has a total of US\$ 497,000 in-kind co-finance committed and that the rest (US\$ 5.19 million) is investment mobilized fully dedicated to Component 2 (refer to snapshot below), it would not be possible for the project to reach such a 10% ratio. After reworking on the co-finance budget, the maximum PMC co-finance we can achieve for this project would be US\$ 300,000, since we also need to keep a certain amount of in-kind contributions to the 4 project components. This amount of US\$ 300,000 of PMC co-finance corresponds to about 5.6% of the Subtotal co-finance budget. We hope you will find this ratio sufficient, given the specificities of the co-finance distribution for this project.

No.	Co-finance partner		Nature of co-finance		Co-finance contribution per project Component in US\$					Total in US\$
	Name	Source	Type	Investment Mobilized	C1	C2	C3	C4	PMC	
1	Ministry of Transport	Recipient Country Government	Public Investment	Investment mobilized		5,000,000				5,000,000
2	Ministry of Transport	Recipient Country Government	Public Investment	Investment mobilized		190,000				190,000
3	Ministry of Transport	Recipient Country Government	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000	15,000	15,000	5,000	55,000	100,000
4	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Recipient Country Government	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	15,000	15,000	15,000	47,000	210,000	302,000
5	Ministry of Petroleum, Energy and Renewable Energies	Recipient Country Government	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
6	UNEP	GEF Agency	In-Kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	25,000	45,000
Total					40,000	5,235,000	45,000	67,000	300,000	5,687,000

Total investment:
US\$ 5.19 million
(fully dedicated to Component 2)

Total in-kind:
US\$ 497,000
(for all components and PMC)

Regarding the 2nd part of the comment, the Executing Agency (i.e. the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development) is unfortunately only able to commit in-kind co-finance to this project, so it will not be in a position to share the direct cost of the Chief Technical Advisor through cash contributions. We have however now increased the share of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development's in-kind contribution to PMC to US\$ 210,000, as a way to better reflect its role and duties as the Executing Agency for this project.

2. Thank you for your comment. The co-finance type of the Ministry of Transport has now been corrected in Table C.

6 April 2021

1. The co-finance letters from the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Energy have been translated in English. These translations have been uploaded on the 'Documents' section of the GEF Portal.

2. The first loss guarantee provided through a risk sharing facility is developed and implemented as part of sub-component C2 of the AUMP. It is worth USD 17,800,000. This is not considered co-financing to the GEF e-mobility project since it will mainly serve the renewal of conventional vehicles for use in taxi fleets as part of the scrappage scheme introduced by the AUMP. This has been clarified in the CEO Endorsement document.

3. The co-finance categories / types have been corrected in Annex I-2.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The amount presented in Table D is the all that is left in the country's CCM STAR allocation. GEFSEC considers that the proposed project approach is cost-effective to meet the stated objectives.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The Agency has reported about the use of PPG funds in Annex C. There are unused and uncommitted funds still available, and the Agency has stated the following: "The balance of unspent and uncommitted funds (US\$ 5,808.13) will be used to undertake exclusively preparation activities up to one year of CEO Endorsement/approval date. No later than one year from CEO endorsement/approval date, UNEP will report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report."

This is acceptable as it is in line with the current Guidelines to the GEF project cycle (annex II, para 4).

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The estimated/expected amount of GHG emission reductions remains broadly in line with the initial estimated presented in the chld project concept. Initial estimates at the time of the submission of the PFD were of: 177,379 (metric tons of CO₂e) of which 100,801 direct and 76,578 indirect.

CEO ER estimates rely on a more dependable set of assumptions and reflect the increased amount of co-financing available: 82,547 direct and 148944 (indirect).

Agency Response

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 04/12/2021, FB:

All comments were addressed satisfactorily.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The general problem is outlined in the "project justification" section. However:

1. The section on barriers needs work. The way barriers are presented is confusing, and we suggest a more clear presentation of each barrier. Each paragraph should start with a clear definition of the barrier, and then an explanation: e.g. "Old rolling stock:", "Inadequate Road Infrastructure:". As presented, this section is difficult to navigate. For instance, root causes presented in the third and fourth paragraph seem to be overlapping (limited expertise/knowledge), to avoid duplication.

2. For each of the barrier/root causes presented, it should be clear whether the project does something to address it, or not. For instance, there doesn't seem to be any activity that specifically address the "inadequate road infrastructure", presented as barrier n. 2. There needs to be a clear link between each barrier identified and the project's components/activities/outputs. In case one or more of the barriers/root causes is not directly addressed by the project's scope, this should be mentioned. For instance, there doesn't seem to be anything in the project framework to address the issue of old rolling stock (which was partially addressed by the GFEI project).

3. Related to the points above, there is no theory of change section for this project. One should be included, that clearly links each one of the activities to an output that addresses directly one or more of the barriers/root causes identified. The section on theory of change should include both a narrative and a diagram. Guidance from STAP on theory of change should be followed: https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_web.pdf

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The section on Root Causes and Barriers has been restructured as suggested by the reviewer.
2. Clear links between the identified root causes and barriers and the project's intervention have been included in the CEO Endorsement Document, both in the section 1) on Root Causes and Barriers as well as in the section 3) on the Proposed Alternative scenario, in an introductory paragraph for each of the 4 Components.
3. The project's Theory of Change has been included at the end of the section on Root Causes and Barriers, along with a descriptive paragraph.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project baseline is well presented in the document.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021- FB

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The alternative scenario appears adequate as described, however, please consider the following points:

1. in the initial section, before the description of the components, the text abruptly switches from the description of AUMP to the description of the GEF project's Component 2. Is there something missing?

To enhance environmental sustainability and innovativeness, the AUMP is aiming at the introduction of electric public transport modes in two ways: First, the project will feature a 100% electric bus fleet of about 300 units on the BRT system. Second, the taxi and minibus renewal component will offer a premium for scrapping obsolete vehicles when new ones are bought. This scrapping premium will be managed through the mechanisms of the PAMOSSET, whereby the FDTR will oversee the channeling of PAMOSSET funds for fleet renewal to clients. Scrapping premiums paid for a minibus and a taxi are CFAF 3m and CFAF 1m⁴⁸, respectively, and typically this premium is only used for vehicles with conventional engines. On top of this, AUMP will grant a bonus for electric vehicles and components on a pilot basis. These subsidies for electric vehicles will be enhanced by the establishment of a first loss guarantee to cover a risk-sharing facility (RSF, based on the principles already introduced under the PAMOSSET), which will be set up by the International Finance Corporation (IFC) in cooperation with commercial bank partners. The RSF will reduce the risk of banks to provide financing to fleet operators who wish to deploy electric vehicles, which in turn will result in preferential loan conditions.

Component 2 on “Short term barrier removal through feasibility analyses, the demonstration of electric vehicles and know-how development for a wider introduction of electric mobility in Côte d’Ivoire” will be co-executed by the MINEDD and the MOT. The piloting of electric taxis and minibuses will be jointly implemented by MINEDD and MOT, based on the scrappage scheme / EV bonus and risk-sharing facility funded through the AUMP. While the AUMP is focusing on clean and efficient mobility in Abidjan, the GEF project will prepare for the broader e-mobility framework at the national level. The GEF project will lay the institutional and policy-framework while the AUMP will conduct a feasibility study on technical/economic opportunities for the electrification of public transport modes serving feeder lines along the Yopougon-Bingerville BRT corridor, provide the financing mechanism to introduce and scale-up e-mobility Côte d’Ivoire, and train drivers and mechanics that will operate electric vehicles and associated equipment. The joint implementation will be ensured through project focal points within the GEF Project Management Unit (PMU) under the MINEDD and the AUMP Project Coordination Unit (PCU) under AMUGA / MOT.

Component 1: Institutionalization of and strategy-setting for low-carbon electric mobility in urban public transport.

2. The relation between what AUMP does, and the GEF project could be clearer. We suggest adding a table that clearly lists what the AUMP does and how that is complemented by the GEF project. For instance, this section mentions that "*While the AUMP is focusing on clean and efficient mobility in Abidjan, the GEF project will prepare for the broader e-mobility framework at the national level.*" However, the entire component 2 of the GEF project seem to focus on Abidjan, including outputs 2.5-2.6. As mentioned above, a clear table differentiating activities implemented under AUMP and under the GEF (and those implemented jointly) would be very helpful.

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. These paragraphs are meant to introduce the fact that under its Component 2, the GEF funded project will seek to create synergies with the AUMP project (implemented through the MOT). The wording has been slightly revised in the CEO ER to clarify this.

2. In addition to the description in the text under each component, a table clearly outlining the execution arrangements between the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MINEDD) and the Ministry of Transport (MOT) has been added at the beginning of the Alternative Scenario section. This table also outlines the outputs funded by the GEF and the ones co-financed through the AUMP (implemented by the MOT). Particularly for Component 2, the table explains how the GEF funded e-mobility project will support / complement the work on the AUMP co-financed outputs (i.e. Outputs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3). This is also detailed in Annex K (Project implementation arrangements) of the CEO Endorsement Document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project remains well aligned with the relevant focal area elements, particularly CCM 1-2.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

the incremental cost approach, as well as the contribution from the baseline are well elaborated.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, advanced elaboration of the methodology used to calculate emission reductions is included in the project document and in Annex M.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project document includes specific narrative to highlight innovation and sustainability of results/impacts.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes the project contains a map with location coordinates.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, this is a child project and it's relation/contribution to the Global Program, as well as the support that the project will receive from the Program, are spelled out clearly.

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

This item is cleared.

Additional Comments from GEF PPO:

Stakeholder engagement information is fine, but please note that UN Women is not an NGO, but rather it's an agency part of the UN System.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the project documents include a detailed report of the stakeholders consulted and their respective roles in the project implementation structure. During project implementation, thematic groups and national workshops will be used to continue to engage the relevant groups.

Agency Response

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

this item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021, FB - the responses from the Agency on the gender-related indicator is noted.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

yes, the gender section include a gender analysis and a gender action plan. Please address the following comment:

1. the document mentions that the project will apply a 30% minimum target for participation of women to committees and capacity building components. However, the Action Plan for output 2.3 only includes a target of training 5 out of 150 drivers of EVs. Please clarify the discrepancy.

FIGURE 11: GLOBAL GENDER GAP INDEX CÔTE D'IVOIRE⁶²

The gender gap is most striking in Political Empowerment (score: 0.082). Specifically, only 11% of parliamentarians are female, women in ministerial positions make up 15% of all ministers. Furthermore, only about 16.7% of legislators, officials and managers in Côte d'Ivoire are female. To tackle the problem of female representation, the GoCI has the 'Law 2019-870 promoting the representation of women in elected assemblies'. It stipulates that ballot lists for the election of Deputies to the National Assembly, Senators, and Regional, District and Municipal Councilors must include at least 30% women. This project will use this quota as minimum target to be achieved when it comes to the composition of committees, participation in capacity building measures, etc. Furthermore, by Ministerial Order, Gender Units (*genre*) have been established in all sector Ministries to increase consideration of gender aspects in ministerial decision-making processes. The project will liaise with these Gender Units and actively seek their participation during implementation.

According to the GGGI, the labor force participation rate of women was 49.3% and 66.9% for men, but only 10% of women occupied positions of professional and technical workers. In CI's transport sector, women are particularly

⁵⁹ The Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) is a gender parity score ranging from 0: full parity between women and men to 1: full parity between women and men.

⁶⁰ Sources: Value for 2010: <https://data360.worldbank.org/> and value for 2019: World Economic Forum. 2019. Global Gender Gap Report.

⁶¹ Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>

⁶² Source: World Economic Forum. 2019. Global Gender Gap Report.

GEF 7 CEO Endorsement August 17, 2018

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The project will indeed apply the 30% target for participation of women in committees and capacity building events. However, since female taxis and minibuses drivers in Abidjan are extremely rare (as acknowledged in the Gender Action Plan), it would not be realistic at all to set a target of 30% women participation for that very specific category of training beneficiaries. Given these exceptional reasons, the project will therefore actively work to ensure that at least 5 female (but hopefully even more) taxis or minibuses drivers will receive this training. A footnote has been added to the Gender Action Plan to clarify this matter.

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

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Please address the following comments:

1. This section is poorly drafted compared to other sections and does not offer sufficient details on the engagement activities either carried out during design stage or planned for the implementation stage, with specific stakeholders from the private sector. Please include mention of specific private sector actors and or sectors that have participated to the design or will participate to the consultative and coordination bodies of the project, as well as to the pilot initiatives.
2. Please mention the links with the Support and Investment Platform that will be set up for the Africa Region.

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The section on private sector engagement has been redrafted and strengthened, in particular the link with private sector engagement as part of the AUMP and how it links to the GEF project.
2. Links to the Africa Support and Investment Platform have been included in the section on Private Sector Engagement.

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

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

Comments 01/25/2020, FB:

Please consider and address the following comments:

1. Risk # 2 seems to be as technical as political. Please revise the categorisation.

2. Climate risk assessment: the assessment of climate risk is completely lacking. The short mention included is definitely not sufficient to satisfy the GEF SEC and STAP guidance on this, especially since this project is already at CEO ER stage. Please follow the STAP guidance and elaborate more on climate risk and countermeasures adopted in relation to all components, including those implemented by the MOT.

3. COVID 19 analysis: there doesn't seem to be any mention of possible opportunities to generate green jobs in the e-mobility value chain and battery reuse/disposal business. This should be mentioned, as appropriate, as this is also mentioned in the section on co-benefits.

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The risk category has been revised.
2. A Climate Risk Assessment following STAP guidelines has been added to the CEO Endorsement document as part of the Section on 5. Risks.
3. The possibility of generating green jobs within the e-mobility value chain has been added to the COVID 19 analysis.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, the coordination and institutional arrangements are well described, including the link with the AUMP project which is being executed in parallel with funding from the World Bank.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Alignment with national priorities is well covered.

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

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The KM approach is adequately described.

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

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

The M&E plan is included, however:

1. Please cut and paste it in the main body of the CEO ER on the portal.

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The M&E Plan has been pasted in the main body of the CEO ER in the Portal.

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
This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2020, FB:

The socio-economic co-benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

Comments 01/25/2021, FB:

Yes, all required annexes are provided. However, please:

1. cut and paste the following items in the relevant sections of the live CEO ER upload in the portal, so that they are included in the document that is automatically generated/printed. This is important as some users (i.e. Council Members) may not have access to all documents uploaded in the document section:

a. M&E plan

b. Logframe

- c. Detailed Budget
- d. Comments from Council
- e. Comments from STAP

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The following items have been copied / pasted in the CEO ER on the live Portal:
 - a. The M&E Plan table has been pasted in section ?9. *Monitoring and Evaluation?* of the live Portal.
 - b. The logframe has been pasted in the sub-section ?3) *Proposed alternative scenario with a description of project components, outcomes, outputs and deliverables?* of the live Portal.
 - c. The detailed budget has been pasted in the Annex F field of the live Portal.
 - d. The Council comments and replies have been pasted in the Annex B field of the live Portal.
 - e. The STAP comments and replies have been pasted in the Annex B field of the live Portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2020, FB:

The result framework is attached as Annex A. Please cut an paste it in the main body of the live portal document.

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The results framework is already included in the dedicated Annex A field of the live Portal.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2020, FB:

GEFSEC comments are provided through this review sheet. Comments which were provided to the Program Document and child project concepts have been addressed at the time when the PFD was first submitted for GEFSEC review and Council approval.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

01/25/2021 - FB - Responses to Council comments, both for the original PFD submission and the Addendum, have been added to the Prodoc as Annex B.4.

1. Please include such comments in an annex to the CEO ER document live on the portal, so that they show up when printed from the portal (or downloaded as PDF).

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The Council comments and replies have been pasted in the dedicated Annex B field of the live Portal.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

01/25/2021 - FB - Responses to STAP comments have been added to the Prodoc as Annex B.4.

1. Please include such comments in an annex to the CEO ER document live on the portal, so that they show up when printed from the portal (or downloaded as PDF).

Agency Response

6 April 2021

1. The STAP comments and replies have been pasted in the dedicated Annex B field of the live Portal.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None received.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None received.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None received.

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2020, FB:

The Agency has reported about the use of PPG funds in Annex C. There are unused and uncommitted funds still available, and the Agency has stated the following: "The balance of unspent and uncommitted funds (US\$ 5,808.13) will be used to undertake exclusively preparation activities up to one year of CEO Endorsement/approval date. No later than one year from CEO endorsement/approval date, UNEP will report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report."

This is acceptable as it is in line with the current Guidelines to the GEF project cycle (annex II, para 4).

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

This item is cleared.

Comments 01/25/2020, FB:

The project includes a map and GSP coordinates of the project location.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
04/29/2021, FB: The Project is being recommended for technical clearance.

rev. 04/19/2021 - FB

PPO comments have been added to the review sheet and need to be addressed by the Agency.

rev. 04/12/2021 - FB

The project is ready for PPO review.

Not yet - the Agency is requested to address the comments included in this review sheet and resubmit.

Please note: the exception regarding direct execution of some project resources by UNEP has been approved by the GEF Manager via email on 11/20/2020. The email is uploaded on the document section.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/25/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/19/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project's objective is to accelerate the introduction of electric mobility and generate GHG emission reductions in Cote d'Ivoire. The project, which is being implemented in close collaboration with a World Bank-funded project introducing an 100% electric Bus Rapid Transport system, aims to achieve such objectives through several components. These include a revision of the policy and institutional framework, training and capacity building to public and private stakeholders, demonstration and piloting of electric vehicles, development of financial schemes and business models and the preparation of scale-up and replication beyond the project's lifetime. The project will support initial investments of Cote d'Ivoire in electric vehicles, with a focus on the public transit sector. The project is expected to result in a reduction of carbon emissions of 230,000 tons compared to a business as usual baseline, and includes a gender-related focus to promote women's participation in policy making and technical services, as well as increased access by female customers to the public transit systems.

In relation to the COVID-19 crisis, the project faces a number of risks but also poses opportunities. Identified risks include the shift of Government priorities and funding away from environmental and climate related spending to support COVID responses, a reduced taxi and minibus demand which could impact the willingness of operators to invest in new technologies and restriction to in person project related meetings. Opportunities include generation of green jobs in the electric mobility value chain and service industry, an increase in air quality which would reduce COVID impacts, and project budget savings from reduced travel and meeting expenses, which could be re-invested in new networking and teleconferencing technologies.