



Global Programme to Support Countries to Upscale Integrated Electric Mobility Systems - Addendum June 2024

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11516

Countries

Global (Palau, Rwanda)

Project Name

Global Programme to Support Countries to Upscale Integrated Electric Mobility Systems - Addendum June 2024

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/15/2024

Review completed by PM

3/20/2024

Program Manager

Filippo Berardi

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

CLEARED.

04/23/2024:


1. cleared

2. cleared.

03/20/2024, FB:

1. Please include a program commitment deadline for the new child projects included in the addendum.

2. The PFD Information Section lists one executing entity in Palau, which is not included in the LOE. Please delete it from Portal entry and include t.b.d. (to be determined) ? also remove the type of Agency (Government) ? this could be included during the preparation phase.

GENERAL PROGRAM INFORMATION 			
Program Title:	Global Programme to Support Countries to Upscale Integrated Electric Mobility Systems - Addendum June 2024		
Country(ies):	Global, Palau, Rwanda	GEF Program ID:	11516
Lead GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Program ID:	
Other GEF Agency(ies):		Submission Date:	3/15/2024
Type of Trust Fund:	GET		
Anticipated Program Executing Entity(ies):	Bureau of Budget and Planning, Ministry of Finance of Palau	Anticipated Program Executing Partner Type(s):	Government
	Koror State Solid Waste Management Office, Koror State Government (Palau)		Government
	Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA)		Government
Sector (only for Programs on CC):	Transport/Urban	Program Duration (Months):	48
GEF Focal Area:	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:	

Agency's Comments

04/23/2024, UNEP:

1. The programme commitment deadline for the new child projects has been included.
2. The executing agency for Palau is indicated as t.b.d. (to be determined) and the type of Agency (Government) has been removed. These changes have been made in the portal as requested, but in the PFD and the Palau concept notes as well (highlights in green).

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

Secretariat's Comments Cleared.

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

- a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/20/24, FB:

The program summary is consistent with approved PFD, however the number of people directly benefiting from the program is currently not mentioned in the summary. Please include a brief mention of this (and of any other GEBs from indicators 9 and 10, if any - please see below comment), in the summary section.

Agency's Comments

04/23/2024, UNEP:

The number of direct beneficiaries and the targets for indicators 9 and 10 have been added to the summary (highlighted in green).

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

a), b) and c): Consistent with approved PFD.

d) and e): PMC is about 7%, which is below the cap of 9% for MSPs below \$2M.

Agency's Comments

4 Program Outline

A. Program 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 program design?**

- b) Has 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 program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?**
- d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?**
- e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Program Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?**
- c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?**
- e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?**
- f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?**

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Most of the elements required in terms of program coherence and consistency are consistent with the approved PFD.

The additional countries selected will contribute to achieving the overall program objectives, while benefitting from participating to the global program's activities.

The short concept notes describing the child projects provide good alignment with the program objectives and priorities.

Agency's Comments

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

- a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**

- b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

- a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**

- b) 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/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

- c) Are the program'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?**

- d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?**

- e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptative management?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/20/24, FB:

Methodology used to calculate core indicator 6 values is consistent with approved PFD.

However, the PFD (GEF ID 11074) includes core indicator 9 (chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced) and core indicator 10 (persistent organic pollutants to air reduced). Please justify why the current addendum PFD doesn't include quantifying core indicators 9 and 10. If possible, please provide an estimate for both indicators.

Agency's Comments

04/23/2024, UNEP:

The Palau and the Rwanda concept notes do not have targets under core indicators 9 and 10, as these impacts are related to the global project activities. The amounts of the global project benefits were not included in the addendum submission, as it only includes additional impacts, thus GHG emission reductions from new countries. The global project scope and related core indicators remain unchanged.

However, we noticed a typo in the units of the Core Sub-Indicator 9.1 targets in the PFD table and the Global Project concept note. Corresponding amendments are highlighted in green. The unit in the PFD has been replaced from kg to metric tons and the methodology has been revised for clarity.

As agreed previously, the approach and the methodology are being refined, the actual estimations will be updated in the CEO Endorsement request document, the team is confident to achieve the target comfortably.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

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 and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Rwanda and Palau decided to join the program with their available STAR resources.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

Consistent with approved PFD.

Agency's Comments

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) 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):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

GEF financing tables are correctly filled in, in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Country STAR allocation is available.

Agency's Comments
Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
IP Set Aside

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
IP Contribution

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

f) The indicative FA elements are aligned with the respective program focus and expected results.

g) On cofinancing, please see comment in the relative section below (section 9.5).

Agency's Comments

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's CommentsCleared.

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's CommentsCleared.

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's CommentsCleared.

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared.

03/20/24, FB:

regarding co-financing, we note that while the co-financing sources and types are aligned with the GEF policy requirements, the amounts are far from the aspirational thresholds. Please provide justification for the low levels of co-financing listed, highlighting any effort to identify additional providers, including from the private sector. Please also outline plans to identify additional co-financing sources in advance of the CEO endorsement.

Agency's Comments

04/23/2024, UNEP:

The current concept notes include indicative amounts that are considered conservative, and we will ensure to increase the level of contributions during project preparation phase. UNEP

will encourage the countries to reach out to private sector representatives during in parallel to the stakeholder consultations processes.

In the case of Rwanda, the country is confident that they will be able to secure more co-finance, probably reaching the USD 7Million, based on new projects that are under development but not yet operationalized.

In the case of Palau, the country has a very small economy (GDP ~ 240 million USD), and size of government budget too is small (~124 million USD for 2024). Further the economy is still impacted by Covid downturn and expected to recover by 2025. The current Compact agreement with USA is under finalization and will provide additional budgetary support. Palau is following up with development partners too and will make every effort to increase the Co-finance from 3 million USD.

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child 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's Comments

Cleared.

03/20/24, FB:

1. The LoE from Palau removed the footnote specifying that the designated Executing Entity is subject to capacity assessment by the Implementing Agency, please obtain either a revised LOE with such footnoted or a confirmation email from the OFP agreeing to such condition.

To: Ms Victoria Luque Panadero
UNEP
Gigri Campus, Nairobi, Kenya

Subject: Endorsement for Child Project Title: Enabling the transition to a Zero Emission Transport Sector in Palau

In my capacity as GEF OFF for Palau, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities including, those identified in the National Adaptation Plan (NAP), Low Emissions Development Strategy (LEDs) and the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) and our commitment for decarbonisation and net zero emissions, and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF implementing Agency(ies) listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by the Bureau of Budget and Planning, Ministry of Finance. I request the GEF implementing Agency(ies) to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement/Approval.

The total financing from GEFTF being requested for this project is \$1,600,000, inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Project Financing. The financing requested for Palau is detailed in the table below.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Fin. Agency Fee	Project Prep Grant (PPG)	PPG Agency Fee	
GEFTF	UNEP	CC STAR Alloc.	1,422,390	128,015	45,500	4,095	1,600,000
Total GEF Resources			1,422,390	128,015	45,500	4,095	1,600,000

The STAR Resources indicated above are being endorsed for the project listed above and submitted by the GEF implementing Agency via the GEF Portal

Agency's Comments

04/23/2024, UNEP:

The revised LoE for Palau has been uploaded.

Compilation of Letters of Endorsement Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's CommentsCleared - yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's CommentsCleared - yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's CommentsCleared - yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

04/23/24

Yes, the program addendum is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/20/2024	4/23/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/23/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		