

Integrated adoption of electric mobility in Jordan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10605

Countries

Jordan

Project Name

Integrated adoption of electric mobility in Jordan

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

11/29/2021

Review completed by PM

3/9/2022

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
12/23/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, the project is aligned to CCM-1-2 Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for electric drive technology and mobility.

Agency Response
Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

Please consider and address the following points:

1. Regarding Output 1.1.2, we request the Agency to consider revising the target indicator for this activity to ensure that the joint public-private partnership is endorsed by Government?
2. Regarding Output 1.1.3, we would encourage the Agency to be more ambitious. Although we welcome the development of policy recommendations and revision reports, the GEF project could take an extra step by contributing to the formulation and strengthening of relevant national policy and regulations. Activities 1.1.3.1 and 1.1.3.2 are too vague in the current formulation, and should at least refer to the key policy elements that are considered inappropriate/weak/desirable and which will therefore receive support. In addition, I think support needs to be further broken down and elaborated. If we are spending 120k on 1.1.3 this needs to have more substance in the description of the sub-component and in the ambition re: results and policy *adoption* vs merely elaborating a report to be considered by policy makers.
3. Regarding Component 2, we invite you to include data collection and analysis as part of the pilot demonstration to extract lessons learned and strengthen decision making.
4. Regarding Component 2, we note a reference to the GCF readiness program and the support provided to a pre-feasibility study for the Petra e-bus. Please provide more details on this and outline of the key outcomes of the activity mentioned.
5. Regarding 3.1.2.2 and 3.1.2.3., please provide more details of the type of training activities envisaged considering the requested budget of >\$160k for these training appears to be high.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Output 1.1.2 (and Activity 1.1.2.4 under it) are updated to underline that the output targets the endorsement by the government. PRF is also updated to include this indicator. The wording of the Output 1.1.2 is updated as: Joint public-private partnership roadmap for transitioning towards a more sustainable tourism and transport sector is developed and submitted to the Government for endorsement.
2. The project will develop revision report as well as recommendations report for new policies and submit to the relevant government partners for endorsement towards adoption. Please see revised description of the output (highlighted).
3. Please see Activity 2.1.3.1. that targets data collection and dissemination from the technology demonstration project.
4. Further details on the prefeasibility study are provided. Please see highlighted under Component 2.

5. More details are provided. The trainings will require international expertise. The number of trainings are increased to at least 5 trainings. The budget is reduced to 140k, the amount is transferred to the policy component considering the increase in the scope of work under that component (i.e., revision report submitted to the government for endorsement).

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

04/05/2022, FB

All comments cleared

03/15/2022, PPO

On the co-financing table, please make the following changes:

1. International Finance Corporation: change ?Other? to ?Donor Agency?.
2. Global Green Growth Institute: change ?Other? to ?Donor Agency?.

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

1. We note that the co-finance letters from (i) Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA), (ii) IFC, (iii) UNIDO and (iv) GGGI do not indicate the time frame for the contribution. As discussed, please provide email confirmation about the timeline

over which the co-financing is being provided, from the providers and upload the communication as one pdf file in the document section of the portal.

2. Following Council decision GEF/C.39.9, there should be "proportionality" between the PMC covered by co-financing amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding. Please consider ways to increase co-financing for PMC.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Please see pdf uploaded to the portal confirming the time frame for PDTRA and GGGI. The UNIDO letter has been revised and re-uploaded. For confirmation on IFC's co-financing contribution, please refer below to reply to the second comment under Risks section.

2. Done. Please see the co-financing table and updated budget annex. PMC's share in the GEF funding and in the co-financing is both 10%.

Agency Response 4 Apr 22

The suggested changes from "other" to "Donor Agency" for IFC and GGGI has been done.

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
12/23/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, the amounts presented in Table D are adequate and considered cost effective to meet the project's 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
12/23/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, a PPG status report is provided in Annex C.

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
03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

Please address the following commented based on Table E of the CEO Approval document:

1. Regarding Indicator 6 and Indicator 6.2, please correct the Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect). The amount provided in the Portal corresponds to the "Total GEF investment, USD" in the EMOB Calculator (USD 1,239,564) and not the "Indirect emission mitigation 2022 -2037, tCO₂" (1,148,785 tCO₂)

Please address the comments below based on the GHG emission calculator workbook *Others EMOB-Bus-GHG Calculator-10605-Jordan.xlsx*:

2. Regarding *For validating?* tab: Please update the Sources column accordingly. It seems like this column was not updated, and it makes reference to sources from other countries. For example: *Fuente.Plataforma digital ?nica del estado peruano. Parque de Veh?culos Menores inscritos entre 2009 ? 2018?* for the Vehicle Stock, instead of the *Jordanian Drivers and Vehicle Licensing Department (JTI)?* as stated in the Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) of the CEO Approval document.
3. Regarding *Input?* tab: The annual GDP does not seem to match with Jordan's annual GDP. For example, according to the World Bank Data Bank (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=JO>), the GDP of Jordan in 2020 accounted for USD 43.7 billion. However, the excel workbook

uses a GDP of USD 103.4 billion for the same year. This a considerable difference, please revise and correct accordingly.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Corrected, thank you.
2. Sources column under Validating Tab is updated. The data from JTI (national authority) was available and used for the calculations.
3. We would like to clarify that GDP PPP (purchasing power parity) is used for calculation, not GDP, however this was not clearly stated so that is clarified in the Input Tab. The source used for this data is World Economic Outlook, 2019 database.

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

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

Please address additional comments below:

1. The project justification mentions that "38% of the total greenhouse gas (GHG)". However, according to the updated submission of Jordan's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) from 2021, transport was responsible for "28% of the total GHG emissions in year 2016". We kindly ask you to revise this statement and clarify or correct accordingly.
2. The alternative scenario mentions revisits the root barriers. However, some of them are slightly different, yet considerably important. We kindly invite you to revise the text to ensure consistency. This is the fragment we are referring, to avoid confusions: "the root causes of the transport problem are the high government debt levels, lack of successful transport projects, EVs technologies being viewed by government and private sector as risk averse, lack of long-term strategic planning between environment, energy and transport sectors, and the lack of coordination between policy making entities at national and local level leading to inconsistent policy signals."

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Done. It is clarified that the share of the transport sector is 37% within the energy sector. The share of 28% of the total GHG emissions -which is also correct- added to the 4th paragraph under the section 1. Executive summary is updated as well. Please see highlighted.

2. The text is edited to make it consistent with the root causes. Please see highlighted part under section 3 as well as the executive summary.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

Please address additional comments below:

1. The second paragraph of the baseline scenario uses data from 2019. Renewable energy generation data increased significantly (+40% from 2019 to 2020) with the installation of 345MW from 3 RE projects. The rate of RE in the grid is now at 20%. Please revise the section and use updated data.
2. Although the "Baseline Policies" makes reference to the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution of Jordan, 2015, it does not address the updated submission of the country's NDC of 2021 that includes relevant mitigation actions, inter alia: (1) "Increased percentage of electricity generated from renewables to have a share of more 35% by the year 2030", (2) "Improving efficient energy consumption in all sectors by 9%", (3) "Future electric bus fleet? provide new bus services for the cities of Irbid and Zarqa with a public sector funded model." We recommend incorporating the relevant inputs from updated NDC to the project justification.
3. It is mentioned outside the baseline scenario that "Petra was granted two e-buses with two e- high-speed charging stations by Hyundai - Jordan (Unity Trading Est.) for tourist tours back in 2019." We found online** that this project took place from 2018 to 2020. Could you confirm this? If so, are the electric buses and their charging infrastructure under operation in Petra? How will the GEF project build on this demonstration project that is so similar that

what is intended to be done under Component 2 of the GEF project? **
Source: <https://www.hyundai.com/content/dam/hyundai/kr/ko/data/company-report/2021/12/08/2020-move-en.pdf>

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Updated as suggested, thank you.
 2. INDC related targets in the baseline policies section updated with NDC oct 2021.
Please see highlighted part.
 3. Please see the 5th paragraph under Baseline Project. We confirm this, however, the two buses are not in operational due to lack of capacity to operate and the they are simply not enough since the need in Petra is calculated to be around 15 buses according to the pre-feasibility study.
- 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 03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

Please address the following points:

1. Regarding Component 1:
 - 1.1. Regarding Output 1.1.1, is there an specific entity that will be in charge of leading or facilitating the inter-ministerial High-level Forum on E-mobility (HFE)? Please elaborate on the plan to ensure the sustainability of the HFE after the lifetime of the GEF's project.
 - 1.2. Moreover, Activity 1.1.1.1 makes reference to an "existing coordination committee". Could you please elaborate on the work of this existing group and provide a clear connection with the establishment of the HFE?
 - 1.3. Regarding Activity 1.1.1.3, we kindly request you to be more specific about the knowledge that is intended to be exchanged. Do you have an specific topic in mind, for example?
 - 1.4. Regarding Activity 1.1.1.4, "Organize and participate to annual HFE events" may seem too broad. We invite you to elaborate on what will be the contribution of the GEF project to these HFE events.
 - 1.5. Activity 1.1.2.1 focuses on "sustainable tourism transport". Although this may be a relevant topic, it goes beyond the scope of electric mobility. We

recommend revising this Activity to make sure that electric mobility can contribute to a "more sustainable tourism transport sector", as stated by Output 1.1.2.

- 1.6. There seems to be a gap between Output 1.1.2 and Activity 1.1.2.4, since the Output aims to reach ?submission *for endorsement?* by the government and the Activity only aims for submission. Please revise writing of Activity 1.1.2.4. The final result aimed for should be *endorsement* by the Government.

2. Regarding Component 2:

- 2.1. There is no prior mention to the GCF readiness project nor prefeasibility study associated to it in the baseline scenario. Please provide more detail about this project and explain the complementarity with the GEF project and Output 2.1.2. How will you ensure that the timing of the outcomes of both projects coincide? If it is not possible, how will you address it in order to maximize synergies between the two funding streams?
- 2.2. Considering that there is a significant amount of co-finance allocated for the demonstration project, please provide a clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities for the Petra E-bus project and the contribution of the GEF project. For example, who will procure the e-buses, who will own them, who will operate them, who will train operators and technicians?
- 2.3. It is mentioned later in the CEO Approval that "the project's technical assistance enabling the realization of Petra e-bus project is estimated to be equivalent of replacing 4 diesel buses with electric buses charged with renewable energy". Since this information is not included under the proposed alternative scenario, please provide it with reference to the expected number of buses that will be procured and made operational. As also requested in the previous comment we would welcome the inclusion of a short description of the key features of the project to be implemented (key parameters to be analyzed by the feasibility study financed through 2.1.1).
- 2.4. Additional elements that should be indicated regarding Component 2 are:
 - i. Please indicate if you have consulted with potential e-bus and charging infrastructure suppliers about the costing and duration from the procurement process to operation. In other words, how will the Petra E-Bus project deal with "High upfront purchase prices", identified under the root causes and barriers section?
 - ii. A broad exit strategy should also be indicated, even if just tentative at this stage.
 - iii. Focus on data gathering, monitoring and analysis from the pilot should be prioritized as opportunity for learning and informing the scale up/exit.
 - iv. Considering that the baseline scenario describes strong dependence on fossil-based electricity generation, how will the Petra E-Bus project address this situation?

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Regarding Component 1

1.1. Please see the highlighted part under the Output 1.1.1.

1.2. Existing coordination committee was an informal inter-ministerial coordination mechanism, updated.

1.3. Please see the clarification under the Activity 1.1.1.4.

1.4. Please see the clarification under the Activity 1.1.1.4.

1.5. Edited as suggested.

1.6. Edited as suggested.

2. Regarding Component 2:

2.1. Reference made to the prefeasibility study.

2.1.2 The both projects are at the similar development stage and Petra e-bus project is expected to achieve its goals considering the 60 months duration of the GEF project. As part of the technical assistance component, the project will help PDTRA to develop an implementation plan with clear milestones, timeline and milestones and rigorously monitor the progress to ensure that corrective actions to be taken in occurrence of risk of delays (see Risk table as well). Demonstrated ownership of the executing partner (i.e., GGGI), and PDTRA (see co-financing letters) provides that the outcomes of the both projects are aligned. In addition, the project will provide technical assistance in a participatory approach to support PDTRA improve its creditworthiness which is a prerequisite for mobilizing financing. This, together with feasibility study, will accelerate Petra e-bus project to achieve its objective.

2.2 PDTRA aims to procure 13 e-buses in addition to the existing 2 granted by Hyundai - Jordan (Unity Trading Est.) and required charging infrastructure to operate a total of 15 buses in 3 different routes in Petra. PDTRA - with the help of the project- will develop a business model and operational plan based on the two options of either setting up a company to own and operate the fleet, or bring in a private tourist transport company (e.g., from Amman or Aqaba) to manage and operate the e-buses through a public-private partnership modality. Further roles and responsibilities of the project will be fine-tuned and decided during the project implementation (please see Activity 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.1.2).

2.3 Petra e-bus project aims to procure 13 e-buses (in addition to existing 2 granted) and required charging points. Replacing 4 diesel buses is an assumption used for GHG calculations only since the project budget will not directly procure but provide technical assistance to Petra e-bus project. Please see the description of the context of the feasibility study.

2.4 No such consultations specific to Petra's case were done because of confidentiality of public procurement. To tackle high upfront cost barrier, the project will investigate and compare different procurement modalities applicable to Petra e-bus project, such as leasing, joint procurement. Please see paragraph 2 and 3 under Output 2.1.1.

i. Please see paragraph 3 and 4 under Output 2.1.3.

ii. Please see paragraph 3 and 4 under Output 2.1.3.

iii. Please see paragraph 3 and 4 under Output 2.1.3.

iv. Petra e-bus project plan includes PV panel installation. PDTRA has the land secured for a large PV project. The available land is around 200,000 m2. In the updated NDC, Jordan electricity grid has a trend of greening with integration of more RE (Plan of 2030). The share of electricity from renewables in Jordan grew from 0.7% in 2014 to over 13% in 2019, making Jordan a regional front-runner in renewable energy. The updated Master Strategy for the Energy Sector 2020-2030, developed by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, calls for a sustainable future energy supply, diversification of the national energy mix, increased dependency on the share of domestic energy resources, enhanced energy security, and reduced energy dependence and cost of electricity supply. The strategy targets a 31% share for renewables in total power generation capacity and 14% of the total energy mix by 2030.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/23/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, the alignment with the FA CCM is confirmed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

1. It is mentioned later on the CEO Approval that "Petra was granted two e-buses with two e- high-speed charging stations by Hyundai - Jordan (Unity Trading Est.) for tourist tours back in 2019", please clarify if the e-buses of the Petra e-bus project are additional to the two e-buses that have already been granted. If so, please explain what is the

incremental reasoning of the project and make sure that this explanation is consistent between the baseline and proposed alternative scenario.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

This statement is moved under the Baseline Project (please see the 5th paragraph). The two buses are not in operational due to lack of capacity and simply not enough since the need in Petra is calculated to be around 15 buses.

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

12/23/2021, FB

Cleared.

Please refer to comments on the GHG emission reduction calculations earlier in this review sheet.

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

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/23/2021, FB

1. What is the innovative contribution of the Petra E-Bus project of the current GEF project when considering that Petra was already granted two e-buses in 2019?
2. The section mentions: ?relevant policy documents would be drafted for the government to amend or extend current rules providing fiscal incentives or other policy measures to encourage tourism transportation firms to invest in EVs for the first time.? Please add this information to the specific outcome/activity included under the propose alternative scenario/project structure.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Please see the 5th paragraph under Baseline Project. The two buses are not in operational due to lack of capacity. E-buses are still considered as a new technology in the country. The project will support PDTRA to operate the buses, or bring in a private tourist transport company (from Amman or Aqaba) so they would only manage and operate.

2. Thank you, it is moved to under Output 1.1.3.

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
12/23/2021, FB

Cleared.

Maps and coordinates are 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
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, the child project is part of the Global Electric Vehicle Programme. A description of its relationship and contribution to the Programme is provided.

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

04/05/2022, FB

All comments cleared

03/15/2022, PPO

Please include in the portal section a short summary of the stakeholder consultations carried out during the design stage/PPG. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan presents a detailed account, but it is good practice to provide short summary in the portal submission too.

12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

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

Agency Response

Agency Response 4 Apr 22

A summary of stakeholder consultation conducted during the PPG stage is provided in the beginning of the Stakeholders section. Please see it highlighted in the Portal.

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
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, gender analysis has been completed, and an action plan has been laid out.

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
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, the private sector will be a key stakeholder in the project. Private sector representatives were consulted during the design stage and are expected to be consulted to provide inputs to the project.

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
03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/24/2021, FB

Please address additional comments below:

1. Regarding the Operational risk, will the GEF project be resilient to potential delays in delivering the demonstration project under Component 2? For example, e-buses are not an off-the-shelf technology and may require several months from

- procurement to the moment they are ready to circulate in the streets. How will the project address this operational risk?
2. Regarding the Financial risk, we welcome the early engagement with international financing institutions like the International Finance Corporation (IFC). Nonetheless, in this co-financing letter, IFC clarifies that their support "does not constitute an offer or a commitment". How will the project address this financial risk in an unfortunate case that the IFC cannot provide financial support? Have there been discussion with other Financial Institutions to date, which can be mentioned?
 3. A description of the COVID-19 Risk and Opportunities is provided. However, no mitigation measure is provided. Please elaborate accordingly.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. The project team will work in close collaboration with the PDTRA and other national stakeholder and put forward implementation plan including milestones for Petra e-bus project and monitor the progress closely to assess the possible delays in advance and provide recommendations on action points to mitigate this risk. See highlighted part in the risk table.
2. We acknowledge that, as stated in the IFC's co-financing letter, there is no formal offer/commitment at this stage. It would be impossible, of course, for the IFC or any other organization to commit resources to a project without the required due diligence and a full-fledged feasibility study. Since these are key components of the proposed project, we believe the IFC's preliminary indication of its interest and strategic alignment to consider co-financing arrangements is extremely significant. In particular, UNIDO's proposed technical assistance component to help Petra achieve creditworthiness is a prerequisite for any commercial-based financial institution (whether the IFC, other FIs or a local commercial bank, etc.). The IFC would have never considered co-financing without a clear plan to reach/document the project's investment grade status. This is the highest standard of private sector best practice, and we are convinced that it will attract great interest from multiple financial institutions. Indeed, we would like to clarify that UNIDO intends to recommend Petra for a competitive co-financing tender, without any predetermined institution. If Petra did not have the uniquely favorable characteristics described in our project document, the potential to attract commercial-based co-financing would be much more challenging. We trust the IFC letter provides a confirmation that UNIDO's approach is sound and realistic, including from a private sector point of view. The project is aligned with the priorities of IFC.
3. Mitigation measures for COVID-19 risk is added.

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
03/08/2022, FB

Comment addressed. Cleared.

12/24/2021, FB

Yes, the institutional arrangements have been described. The Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI), will be the Executing Agency. However please consider the following comment:

1. As commented in the proposed alternative scenario, please provide more detail about the coordination with the GCF Readiness Program for Jordan mentioned in the Coordination Table of this section.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Please see highlighted part in the Coordination Table.

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
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, alignment with national strategies and plans is described. This section is cleared provided that the reference to the NDC is updated to the latest one, as requested above.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

The reference to the NDC is updated as explained above. Please see 4th paragraph under the section 1.

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
03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/24/2021, FB

The knowledge management approach is included. However, it lacks a timeline and deliverables. Please address this.

Agency Response
Agency Response 17 Jan 22

Done, please see highlighted part under knowledge management 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
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, a budgeted M&E plan is included.

Agency Response
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
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, economic, social, and gender-related benefits are described.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
04/05/2022, FB

All comments cleared

03/15/2022, PPO

Please provide a budget table following the GEF template in accordance with the Guidelines on Project Cycle Policy with relevant expenditure categories e.g. staff costs, consultants, equipment, training, workshop, travel, operating costs, etc. Please note that the current budget tables (per year) are missing the M&E column ? it is needed to determine the reasonability of items charged to M&E (which should match the M&E budget in section 9)

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/24/2021, FB

Please consider the following comments:

1. Please include a screenshot of the budget in the required GEF format in the CEO Approval document.
2. Regarding Annex E: The co-financing amounts expressed in Annex E (?Others_ANNEX E -10605IndicativeProjectBudget?) in cells O193:O198 do not coincide with the co-financing amounts provided in the Portal. Please correct.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

1. Done.
2. Corrected, thank you.

Agency Response 4 Apr 22

The budget table is updated and now includes expenditure categories and M&E section. The amounts are matching with the M&E budget in Section 9 of the project document. Please find the updated budget excel spreadsheet uploaded to the portal. Updated budget tables added to the Annex E as well.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Yes, 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

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/24/2021, FB

Please provide a summary of how the project addressed all Council comments received at the time of the approval of the PFD.

Agency Response

Agency Response 17 Jan 22

Responses to Council comments added. The rest of Annex B has been uploaded at the time of the submission of the CEO document (Roadmap -> Document).

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/08/2022, FB

All comments addressed. Cleared.

12/24/2021, FB

Please provide a summary of how the project addressed all STAP comments received at the time of the approval of the PFD.

Agency Response

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
04/05/2022, FB

All comments cleared

03/15/2022, PPO:

The table included in Annex C should include the list of activities and relative budget used. We recognize this information is provided in the section below, but please consolidate the data in the first table:

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i> | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| | <i>Budgeted Amount</i> | <i>Amount Spent to Date</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| - | 50,000 | 33,000 | 17,000 |
| Total | 50,000 | 33,000 | 17,000 |

12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

A PPG utilization status report is provided.

Agency Response

Agency Response 25 Mar 22

The list of activities conducted during the PPG stage are included in the table with the respective budget allocations. Please see the updated Annex C portal section.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/24/2021, FB

Cleared.

Maps and coordinates provided.

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

Yes, the project is being recommended for technical clearance.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| First Review | 12/25/2021 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/8/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/16/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/5/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | |

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project is recommended for technical clearance.

The project is implemented by UNIDO and is executed by the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI). The project is requesting US\$1,137,215 from GEF and has a co-finance contribution of \$7.1 million.

The project's objective is to catalyze and accelerate the breakthrough of electric mobility in urban areas in Jordan through innovation and technology transfer. The project will provide technical assistance based on the international best-practices to support the Petra E-Bus project to successfully achieve its goals to demonstrate replicability and scaling up e-mobility interventions in Jordan. The project is expected to result in GHG emission reduction of 1,643,665 tCO₂eq (direct + indirect).

The project has four components:

1. Policy coordination and integration; establishment of an inter-ministerial High-level Forum on E-mobility (HFE) to support an enabling policy environment for e-mobility.
2. Technical assistance to ?Petra E-bus Project? to demonstrate replicability and Scaling Up E-mobility interventions
3. Capacity building and Knowledge Management for facilitating the adoption of E-mobility

4. Monitoring and evaluation

Regarding risks associated with the COVID-19 pandemic:

The number of visitors to Petra in 2020 decreased to 252,728 due to the restrictions imposed to contain the Covid-19 crisis. The city was closed in March 2020. The pandemic hit the Jordanian tourism sector, which was contributing between 12% to 14% of the GDP, and tourism income decreased from 5.8 billion dollars in 2019 to one billion in 2020, according to official figures. Due to the pandemic lockdowns, all public transport services were stopped for about than 3 months. The Land Transport Regulatory Authority later resumed operations in July 2020 but dropped capacity to 50%; however, in April 2021 the capacity was increased to 75%. Starting July 1st 2021, full capacity of operation will return as the second phase of the government's plan to reopen all sectors enters into force.

Regarding opportunities associated with the COVID-19 pandemic:

The project will potentially benefit from the government's COVID-19 financial recovery package for the tourism sector, as well as the public and private investment in e-mobility. The total government package to support the tourism sector post COVID-19 in direct and indirect cash flow amounts to 268 million USD. The package includes facilitating low-interest loans from the Central Bank Advance Program with guarantees from the Jordanian Loan Guarantee Company. The loan periods could be up to 42 months, including a grace period of 12 months, where the government bears 2% of the interest on these loans throughout the loan period. Another portion of the package will constitute the "Tourism Risk Fund" which provides support to the tourism sector in the form of exemptions of license renewal fees, tax exemptions, and payment of owed income taxes in zero-interest instalments.