

# Electric mobility for sustainable tourism in Albania

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10610

**Countries**

Albania

**Project Name**

Electric mobility for sustainable tourism in Albania

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

12/2/2021

**Review completed by PM**

4/29/2022

**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  
COMMENTS FROM PPO, 4/27/2022

PLEASE NOTE WE NEED RESUBMISSION ASAP TO PROCESS THE PROJECT BEFORE DEADLINE - please resubmit by May 1st at the very latest.

1. cleared.

2. The budget table as included is illegible, too small. We need the table to be readable from the portal version, as council members do not have ready access to separate excel file uploaded in the document section. As a suggestion, please consider presenting in the summary table only the outcomes (not broken down by outputs) which may save space. Here are a couple of examples of a simplified budget that can be used as template:

GEF Expenditure Category & Detailed Description	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Sub-total	M&E	PMC	Total
<b>02. Goods</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>59,000</b>			<b>89,000</b>			<b>89,000</b>
Data management system, incl. Webpage integration and information platform	30,000				30,000			30,000
Procurement of a 10kWp grid connected solar plants and its installation		20,000			20,000			20,000
Procurement of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and its installation		39,000			39,000			39,000
<b>03. Vehicles</b>		<b>157,200</b>			<b>157,200</b>			<b>157,200</b>
Vehicle GPS monitoring systems and user connectivity apps		7,200			7,200			7,200
Procurement of electric vehicles		150,000			150,000			150,000
<b>06. Sub-contract to executing partner/entity</b>	<b>10,000</b>				<b>10,000</b>			<b>10,000</b>
Grenada National Training Agency	10,000				10,000			10,000
<b>07. Contractual services (company)</b>		<b>3,000</b>			<b>3,000</b>		<b>18,000</b>	<b>21,000</b>
Independent financial audits					0		18,000	18,000
Vehicle maintenance		3,000			3,000			3,000
<b>09. International Consultants</b>	<b>296,500</b>	<b>33,600</b>	<b>73,801</b>	<b>14,000</b>	<b>417,901</b>	<b>30,000</b>		<b>447,901</b>
Terminal Evaluation					0	30,000		30,000
Consultancy on sustainable transport, promotion and finance of electric mobility	219,100	26,600	56,000	14,000	219,100			219,100
Consultancy on gender and socio-economic (just transition) impact	20,000		17,801		37,801			37,801
Consultancy on renewable energy technologies	42,000	7,000			49,000			49,000
Consultancy on electricity distribution grid stabilization and climate resilience	35,000				35,000			35,000
Data Management System Provider and Consultancy	35,000				35,000			35,000
Consultancy on gender-sensitive community engagement	42,000				42,000			42,000
<b>10. Local Consultants</b>	<b>4,000</b>		<b>80,000</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>91,000</b>		<b>40,600</b>	<b>131,600</b>
Regulatory Framework Expert and Legal Advisor	4,000		80,000	7,000	91,000			91,000
Administration and Financial Assistant					0		40,600	40,600
<b>11. Salary and benefits/Staff Costs</b>	<b>36,563</b>	<b>21,000</b>	<b>23,438</b>	<b>7,279</b>	<b>88,279</b>		<b>32,000</b>	<b>120,279</b>
Chief Technical Advisor	36,563	21,000	23,438	7,279	88,279		32,000	120,279
<b>12. Training, Workshops, Meetings</b>	<b>12,500</b>		<b>4,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>18,500</b>	<b>500</b>		<b>19,000</b>
Services and logistics to support meetings	5,000				5,000			5,000
Workshops	7,500		4,500	1,500	13,500			13,500
Inception workshop					0	500		500
<b>13. Travel</b>	<b>50,000</b>				<b>50,000</b>			<b>50,000</b>
Travel expenses for the global and regional programmes on electric mobility	50,000				50,000			50,000
<b>15. Other operating costs</b>					<b>0</b>		<b>4,938</b>	<b>4,938</b>
Office and IT equipment					0		4,938	4,938
<b>Total general</b>	<b>439,563</b>	<b>273,800</b>	<b>181,738</b>	<b>29,779</b>	<b>924,879</b>	<b>30,500</b>	<b>95,538</b>	<b>1,050,917</b>

GEF budget category & detailed description	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Subtotal	M&E	PMC	Total
<b>02. Goods</b>						0	3,578	3,578
Hardware						0	3,578	3,578
<b>03. Vehicles</b>		45,000			45,000			45,000
Procurement of 6 micro/L6 electric vehicles		45,000			45,000			45,000
<b>07. Contractual services (company)</b>	95,000	242,000	170,000	50,000	557,000		15,600	572,600
Consultancy on communication and stakeholder engagement	60,000				60,000			60,000
Consultancy on environment and waste management			25,000	50,000	75,000			75,000
Consultancy on socio-economic impact of electromobility			45,000		45,000			45,000
Consultancy on transport and vehicle electrification	35,000	20,000	100,000		155,000			155,000
Independent financial audits					0		15,600	15,600
Leasing of electric vehicles		216,000			216,000			216,000
Vehicle monitoring services (including data management system)		6,000			6,000			6,000
<b>08. Contractual services (individuals)</b>	55,000				55,000	30,000		85,000
Consultancy to design and implement the Knowledge Management System	55,000				55,000			55,000
Terminal Evaluation					0	30,000		30,000
<b>11. Salary and benefits/Staff Costs</b>	107,503	119,704	125,073	24,382	376,661		45,000	421,661
Chief technical advisor	47,040	60,960			108,000		21,600	129,600
Gender specialist	16,363	8,182	12,273	8,182	44,999			44,999
Junior Technical Officer	15,300	7,362	3,600		26,262		23,400	49,662
Project Economist			56,400		56,400			56,400
Regulatory Framework Expert and Legal Advisor	10,800		31,200	9,000	51,000			51,000
Technical Officer	18,000	43,200	21,600	7,200	90,000			90,000
<b>12. Training, Workshops, Meetings</b>	8,100	3,600	5,400	5,400	22,500	3,600		26,100
Coordination body meeting logistics (venue, catering and IT)	4,500				4,500			4,500
Workshops	3,600	3,600	5,400	5,400	18,000	3,600		21,600
<b>13. Travel</b>	51,025	1,500			52,525			52,525
Local travel expenses for staff	6,025	1,500			7,525			7,525
Travel expenses for the global and regional programmes on electric mobility	45,000				45,000			45,000
<b>14. Office supplies</b>					0		1,000	1,000
Office supplies					0		1,000	1,000
<b>15. Other operating costs</b>		21,600			21,600		51,211	72,811
Pilot project running costs and operation and maintenance expenditures		21,600			21,600			21,600
Procurement, HR, legal and record keeping costs					0		51,211	51,211
<b>Total general</b>	<b>316,628</b>	<b>433,404</b>	<b>300,473</b>	<b>79,782</b>	<b>1,130,286</b>	<b>33,600</b>	<b>116,389</b>	<b>1,280,275</b>

**COMMENTS FROM PPO, 3/30/2022**

1. On Status of Utilization of PPG: there are two tables: the first one shows the status of the lumpsum of which \$31,000 have been spent to date while \$19,000 is the amount committed:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
	50,000	31,000	19,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>31,000</b>	<b>19,000</b>

the second one lumps together amounts spent and committed.

Activities	Budgeted Amount	Amount spent/committed to date	Timeline[1]	Verification at CEO endorsement submission
Assessing the capacity of the proposed national executing agency (N CETSD) and drafting ToR	13,500[2]	13,500	Sep 2020 – Apr 2021	Done. Internal Project Execution Assessment report (PEAR) based on HACT methodology is conducted. The capacity of the project executing entity has been found adequate. ToR for national execution is developed.
Development of the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) outlining the relevant risks as well as the mitigation measures ESMP for the project	36,500	36,500	Sep 2020 – Apr 2021	Done. ESMP is developed and shared along with the submission package.
Pre-feasibility studies on e-mobility investments				Done (equivalent activity). The project analyzed the project concepts and shortlisted pipeline projects to provide TA assistance.
Development of the gender analysis and action plan				Done. Gender Analysis and action plan is developed and shared along with the submission package.
Verifying the baseline data on mobility, urban challenges and tourism sector				Done. The baseline information is verified and incorporated into project.
Stakeholder consultations with EV producers on mobilizing additional co-financing				Done. The outcome of the discussion with Alba light ltd integrated into project. Co-financing letter is obtained.
Stakeholder consultations and workshops to verify the CEO endorsement project document				Done. The project team conducted inception and validation workshop along with bilateral meetings with national stakeholders.
Formal validation of the CEO approval document, UNIDO internal review and submission to GEF Sec			May – Dec 2021	Ongoing
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>		

This is confusing. We request the Agency to please include all information in the first table and to list detailed information on budget items for which budgeted amounts have been either committed or spent. The current level of financial breakdown provided in the second table is not detailed enough.

2. On the budget table included in Annex E in Portal:

2.1. budget information are presented year by year. This does means that to have the total amount for instance of the PMC, we need to sum up manually the amounts from each years. The Agency is requested to include one single table where the amounts are summed up and grand totals are presented for each column.

2.2. The new table should also include a separate column for M&E expenses.

If the Agency have problems in including the table in the portal, please contact GEF IT Services or the Program Manager (Filippo Berardi) for support.

**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, the project remains aligned with the CCM-1-2 entry point, which relates to promoting e-mobility.

Agency Response

Agency Repose 28 Apr 22

A summary of the budget table that follows the above example has been introduced in the CEO document as well as uploaded as an Annex.

1. On Status of Utilization of PPG:

Please see updated table in the respective section in the Portal. The tables are merged into one including the breakdown of the amounts per activity budgeted, committed and spent .

2. On the budget table included in Annex E in Portal:

The budget is updated as requested in a new format listing the components in the columns, as well as showing M&E and PMC expenses. Snapshot of the budget is added to the relevant section in the Portal. The entire budget table in excel is uploaded in the Roadmap -> Documents section entitled "[Albania updated final budget 10610](#)".

**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  
**03/07/2022, FB**

comments addressed. Item cleared.

**12/20/21, FB**

Please address additional comments below:

1. We recommend revising the writing of some of the project Outputs, since some of them are structured as project Activities. Please make corresponding changes in all places where outputs are listed (e.g. in the PRF - annex I).
2. Regarding Output 1.1.2, we welcome the formulation of a "strategic framework for urban mobility plans and investment guidelines". However, we have concerns about prioritizing "low-carbon electric public transportation as the first option" if an urban mobility approach is taken. For example, if employing an urban mobility approach, it would not be recommended to prioritize electric public transportation over active mobility. We invite you to revise the scope and framework of analysis of Output 1.1.2.

## Agency Response

1- The wording of the outputs below are edited to reflect more emphasis on the results. They are also updated in the PRF, budget annex and Table B.

- Output 1.1.2
- Output 1.1.3
- Output 2.1.1
- Output 3.1.2
- Output 3.1.3

2- Thanks. Agreed on this. "low-carbon electric public transportation as the first option" was meant only for "investment guidelines" and not for the strategic framework. To clarify this separation, the output is revised as "Strategic framework for urban mobility plans, and investment guidelines focusing on low-carbon electric public transportation are developed". In addition, reference to active modes as the first option for strategic framework is made under Activity 1.1.2.1.

**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

**03/22/22, FB**

All comments cleared.

**3/7/2022, FB**

Based on the previous comments:

1. Thank you for including the confirmation emails where the timeframe of the co-finance letters is specified. However, the timeframe is still missing for the co-finance letter of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment. We kindly request you to provide this information.
2. cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

Please address additional comments below:

1. None of the co-finance letters provided indicates a period in which the co-finance contribution will occur. Please amend this.
2. Regarding the co-finance letter from Berat Municipality, an investment of USD 500,000 is mentioned ("Smart Energy Municipality" project) in addition to the USD 50,000 reported as a co-finance contribution. Please clarify if these additional USD 500,000 will also be considered.

#### Agency Response

- 1- Please see the annex uploaded in the portal ("[Confirmation emails\\_Co-financing letters time-frame](#)"). The revised UNIDO co-financing letter has also been uploaded.
- 2- "Smart Energy Municipality" which will end by 2024 does not include emphasis on e-mobility angle. This project provides only an indirect contribution to the goals and objectives of the project, therefore it will not be considered as a co-financing contribution from the Municipality of Berat.

-----  
18-Mar-22

The file with confirmation e-mails on the timeframe of the co-financing letters is updated with an e-mail from the Ministry of Tourism and Environment (last page) and re-uploaded to the Portal.

**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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, financing provided is adequate (within the limits of the available STAR allocation) and the project structure is considered cost-effective.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, the PPG utilization status is indicated.

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  
**03/07/2022, FB**

All comments have been addressed or clarified. Cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

With regards to the GHG estimation:

Please address the comments below based on the GHG emission calculator workbook [?\\_EMOB-LDV-GHG-CalculatorAlbania-10610.xlsx?](#):

1. Regarding 'For validating' tab:
  1. Please clarify or correct if the 'Vehicle stock' data source used is from Antigua and Barbuda
  2. Regarding 'Tested FE gasoline hybrid' and 'Tested FE gasoline PHEV', please clarify why the following data source was used 'Energy consumption of electric vehicles based on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing q'?
  3. Similarly, regarding 'Tested FE BEV', please clarify why the following data source was used 'Energy consumption of electric vehicles based on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing q'?
  4. Regarding 'Vehicle prices', please clarify why the following data source was used 'Based on ICCT for Bangkok'? EV prices between countries may vary significantly.
  5. Regarding 'Vehicle maintenances', please clarify or correct the use of 'Based on 30% the maintenance cost of a conventional bus and two battery replacements'. Since this is a light-duty vehicle calculation it is not recommended to use assumptions from heavy-duty vehicles.
  6. Regarding 'Electricity CO2 footprint', please clarify or correct the use of 'Analysis of the grid emission factors for the electricity sector in the Caribbean countries'. Electricity grid emission factors are country specific.
2. Regarding 'Input' tab:
  1. The annual GDP does not seem to match with Albania's annual GDP. For example, according to the World Bank Data Bank (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=AL>), the GDP of Albania in 2020 accounted for USD 14.8 billion. However, the excel workbook uses a GDP of USD 43.6 billion for the same year. This a considerable difference, please revise and correct.
  2. The population per year that has been used also does not seem to match with actual total population. Please revise and correct.
  3. Please clarify if the vehicle stock and vehicle sales employed are at the city or national level accordingly.

With regards to other indicators:

4. We note that indicators 6.3 and 6.4 in the Portal are left blank. Please clarify if these indicators have been calculated.

## Agency Response

Regarding 'For validating' tab:

Validating tab: The values in this tab only serves as reference for comparison to make sure IF national data is not available, assumption made are in the range of real-world data. However, national data in Albania was available and used for the calculations.

1- 'Vehicle stock' data source is Albanian Authority (The General Directorate of Road Transport Services)

2 and 3- Often, the local input data are not available. Wherever this is the case, we have used academic papers as reference points. For the gasoline and diesel LDVs fuel economy values are gathered from 'Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Transportation Projects'. However, the values for HEV and PHEV were not available. Thus, we used an academic paper that compares both technologies under the same driving patterns. This paper called 'Energy consumption of electric vehicles based on real-world driving patterns: A case study of Beijing' is published in the journal Applied Energy which is recognized reputable journal in the field. In addition, these fuel economy values for HEV and PHEV are crossed-checked with other sources to ensure that they are in the range of common values (2021 fuel consumption guide). For the case of BEV, we have used the fuel economy values of Nissan Leaf, a common BEV model, as a reference. Please note that in Albania's case, hybrid cars have a negligible impact in the scenario as it can be seen in the 'Output Graph' tab.

4 and 5- We agree that vehicle prices and maintenance cost can vary between countries. However, due to the technology, in many developing countries, there is not a specific reference for the country since the market is in the developing stage. In these cases, we decided to run the model with Light-duty electric vehicle data from ICCT that is a reputable, scientific organization. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that this input data do not affect the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction results and energy savings.

6- Albanian grid emission factor is used. Source: IGES

<https://www.iges.or.jp/en/pub/list-grid-emission-factor/en>

Regarding Input tab:

1- Please note that GDP PPP (purchasing power parity) is used for calculation, however this was not clearly stated so that is fixed in the Input tab. The source used for this data is WEO October 2021 database:

<https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2021/October/download-entire-database>

2- The population data is updated with the World Bank data.

3- City level. The vehicle stock and vehicle sales are calculated based on the assumption of 25% of the total vehicles and sales are in Berat and Belsh and surrounding or commuting to the area.

With regards to other indicators:

1- The energy savings indicator MJ is added in the portal. Indicator 6.4 is not applicable at this stage.

Please see the highlighted parts in the section f. Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

## **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  
**03/07/2022, FB**

Comment addressed. Cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

1. The following statement is included in the baseline scenario: "the high share of fossil fuel demand is due to the refined petroleum products imported to meet the energy demand of the transport sector which is the largest energy consumer. The share of the transport sector has almost quadrupled since 1990 and amounted to 40% of final energy consumption in 2018 (IRENA, 2021)." However, there is no mention of this in the section/table on root causes and barriers and we invite you to address this point.

#### Agency Response

Barrier on the dependency of Albanian transport sector on fossil fuels are included in the barriers table.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

The baseline scenario is well described.

#### 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

**03/07/2022, FB**

All comments have been addressed or clarified. Cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

Please address the following comments:

1. Regarding Output 1.1.2, we welcome the formulation of a "strategic framework for urban mobility plans and investment guidelines". However, we have concerns about prioritizing "low-carbon electric public transportation as the first option" if an urban mobility approach is taken. For example, if employing an urban mobility approach, it would not be recommended to prioritize electric public transportation over active mobility. We invite you to revise the scope and framework of analysis of Output 1.1.2.
2. Activity 2.1.1.2 mentions that technical support will be provided "for 2 projects". Please elaborate on how these two projects will be (or have been) prioritized and selected for support.

3. Regarding Output 2.1.2, please elaborate on what is meant by "low-carbon e-mobility infrastructure technologies" and provide more detail about the demonstration projects. Table 4 and the subsequent text describes each project. However, we kindly ask you to (1) make an explicit connection between Output 2.1.2 and Table 4 and (2) elaborate on how each shortlisted project will be implemented. For example, please provide more detail about the main roles and responsibilities of each demonstration project (where will the GEF budget make a difference?), will all the assets from the demonstration project be covered by the GEF project?, what is the exit strategy of the demonstration projects, what are the specific actions that will be taken in terms of data gathering? (so that this information can serve as an input of Activity 2.1.2.2), etc.
4. Regarding Output 3.1.3, we invite you to provide more detail about how the GEF budget will contribute to the ongoing initiatives listed. For example, you can be more specific about which "local market actors in electric mobility" will be targeted and what specific topic(s) within electric mobility will be addressed.

#### Agency Response

- 1- Thanks for your comment. "low-carbon electric public transportation as the first option" was meant only for "investment guidelines". To clarify the separation, the output is revised as "Strategic framework for urban mobility plans, and investment guidelines focusing on low-carbon electric public transportation are developed?". In addition, reference to active modes as the first option for strategic framework is made under Activity 1.1.2.1.
- 2- It is described under 2.1.1.2 how (based on criteria) these 2 projects will be prioritized. How the initial 4 projects are identified is described under the section Output 2.1.1.
- 3- Activity 2.1.1.2 selection criteria is explained under the activity section and under table 4.
- 4- Local market actors and the target topics are explained under the Output 3.1.3.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

The alignment with focal area elements is clear.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

The incremental reasoning and contribution from the baseline are well described.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes. The same methodology is being applied across child projects in the Global e-Mobility Program.

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  
**03/07/2022, FB**

All comments have been addressed or clarified. Cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

1. In terms of sustainability, as mentioned in the comment related to Output 2.1.2, we invite you to consider an exit strategy for the pilot demonstration projects to ensure a positive impact even after project completion.

Agency Response

Exit strategy is added and described under sustainability section which includes references to the Activity 2.1.1.2.

**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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, a map is provided.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, a description on the interaction with and contribution to the Program is included in the project document.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, a stakeholder consultation report during the design stage has been provided. It includes an adequate stakeholder engagement plan.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, a gender analysis and a gender action plan have been prepared and submitted for this project, including gender-sensitive indicators.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, the private sector will be a key stakeholder in the project. Private sector representatives were consulted during the design stage. Collaboration with private sector companies is expected during project implementation. Moreover, private sector representatives are expected to be direct beneficiaries of all project components.

Agency Response

**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

**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, the project elaborates on potential risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks, as well as COVID-19 related risks and opportunities. The section on climate change risk included in the project's ESMP is well developed and welcome.

Agency Response

**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

**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, the institutional arrangements have been described. The National Center of Environment, Tourism and Sustainable Development (NCETSD), a CSO, will be the Executing Agency of the project. There are no foreseen exception in the separation of the functions between implementing and executing agency.

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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

The project is consistent with national strategies and plans.

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  
**03/07/2022, FB**

Comment addressed. Cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

Please address the following comment:

1. The KM approach is outlined, however, please include a timeline for the key deliverables included.

Agency Response

Key deliverables and timeline are added in the Knowledge Management section. Please see the highlighted part at the end of the respective section.

**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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, a M&E plan is included.

Agency Response OK.

**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  
**12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

Yes, socio economic and health benefits are included.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**03/07/2022, FB**

Comment addressed. Cleared.

---

**12/20/21, FB**

1. Please add the budget table(s) in the required GEF format to the CEO Approval document.
2. with regards to the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE), Section 9 of the CEO Approval states an indicative cost of the MTE of USD 20,000. However, there is a mismatch in the excel workbook of the budget. Activity 4.1.2.1 (in cell F183) accounts for USD

18,000. However, the sum in the 5 years of the project add up to USD 25,000 (refer to cell R140). Please revise and correct accordingly with the right amount in Section 9 of the CEO Approval and in the budget.

3. Regarding the Project Terminal Evaluation (PTE), Section 9 of the CEO Approval states an indicative cost of the MTE of USD 23,000. However, there is a mismatch in the excel workbook of the budget. Activity 4.1.2.2 (in cell F184) accounts for USD 25,000. However, Activity 4.1.2.2 is not mentioned in the annual budgets. Please revise and correct accordingly with the right amount in Section 9 of the CEO Approval and in the budget.

#### Agency Response

- 1- Activity-based budget table for total years (i), and the budget tables per year (ii) are uploaded to the portal.
- 2- MTE is updated as 20,000. Please note that cell R140 refers to PTE cost.
- 3- PTE is corrected as 23,000. Activity 4.1.2.2 is mentioned in the Year 5, row R140.

#### **Project Results Framework**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **12/20/21, FB**

Cleared.

A PRF is included.

#### Agency Response

#### **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

#### Agency Response

#### **Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**03/07/2022, FB**

Comment addressed. Cleared.

---

**FB, 12.20.2021**

Please add responses to the comments received by council at the time of the approval of the PFD. (Agency can consult for reference other child projects endorsed so far on this point and adapt to the national circumstances as needed).

Agency Response Responses to the comments received by Council is introduced in the CEO document and attached as an annex.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**03/07/2022, FB**

Comment addressed. Cleared.

---

**FB, 12.20.2021**

Please add responses to the comments received by STAP at the time of the approval of the PFD. (Agency can consult for reference other child projects endorsed so far on this point and adapt to the national circumstances as needed).

Agency Response The file containing the responses to the comments received by STAP is too large to be introduced within the CEO document and is therefore available as an annex uploaded to the submission.

**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  
**FB, 12.20.2021**

Cleared.

A status report on the utilization of the PPG was submitted. While there are still available balances, the Agency has up to one year from the endorsement to commit and disburse such balances.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**FB, 12.17.2021**

Cleared. Maps were included.

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

**03/22/22, FB**

All comments have been cleared. The CER ER is being recommended for technical clearance.

---

**03/07/2022, FB**

The GEFSEC received the revised CEO ER form on the portal on February 24th, 2022.

We request the agency to address the last remaining comment on the missing timeframe for one of the co-financing letters and resubmit for technical clearance (before PPO review).

---

**FB, 12.20.2021**

Not yet. Agency is requested to submit responses and address the points raised above.

**\*\* Please highlight in yellow the changes made on the portal version of the CEO approval document for ease of reference. \*\***

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement

Response to  
Secretariat  
comments



**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/20/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/9/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/22/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/30/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/27/2022</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**