



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9367		
Country/Region:	Bhutan		
Project Title:	Bhutan Sustainable Low-emission Urban Transport Systems		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5563 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$15,897,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,536,726
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Xiaomei Tan	Agency Contact Person:	Rakshya Thapa

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: Yes. The proposed project could potentially support the country's INDC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: 1) Please analyze the root causes from the perspective of i) institutional fragmentation, ii) role of the informal	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?	<p>sector in delivering transport services, and iii) inappropriate standards and norms.</p> <p>2) Please justify the scaling-up potential of the project.</p> <p>XT, March 23, 2016:</p> <p>1) Thank you for providing info on the root causes. However, the project design and outputs have been changed accordingly to address these root causes.</p> <p>) The explanation is not clear. The new information suggests that the RGoB aims to replace taxi fleet with IC engines, while the project focus on mass transit system, which is totally different from taxi. Please explain how the project plans to scale up the deployment of low emission vehicles in the mass transit system.</p> <p>XT, May 16, 2016:</p> <p>1) Project design and outputs have been adjusted to address the root causes. Comment cleared.</p> <p>2) Explanation on the local context of "mass" transit is provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>XT, Jan. 25, 2016:</p> <p>Due to a lack of information on baseline projects, it is hard to assess the incremental reasoning. Please</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>clearly define the baseline projects.</p> <p>XT, March 23, 2016:</p> <p>Baseline project info is expected to explain if the country has already developed infrastructure for EVs, such as availability of charging stations, EV components and maintenance services. Without such info, it is unlikely to assess the incremental reasoning of this project.</p> <p>XT, May 16, 2016:</p> <p>Yes, specific baseline info is provided “there are currently six charging stations across Bhutan. Comment cleared.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>XT, Jan. 25, 2016:</p> <p>Overall, table B needs to clarify and address the following issues:</p> <p>1) The scope of EV fleet that is covered by the proposed project. For example, does it cover government fleet (cabinet fleet, government ministry and agency fleet, protocol service cars and police car), which account for a significant portion of vehicles in Bhutan? Further, are vehicles for tourists covered?</p> <p>2) Integration of low-carbon transport into urban land use. Please consult with the World Bank team on</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the projects, "Joint urban and transport program on electric vehicle initiative" and "Bhutan electric vehicle and green transport initiative"</p> <p>Specifically, Component 1:</p> <p>3) Please clearly define "low emissions modes of transport."</p> <p>4) Please explain what "inclusive assessments of people's needs and planning" mean. Is this a kind of resident mobility survey?</p> <p>5) For the statement, "technical and guidelines and standards for low carbon vehicle operators, manufacturers --- " Please explain what kind of low-carbon vehicle manufacture that Bhutan is going to develop.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>6) How will certified training programs will be executed? Are they permanent, or only in operation during the project period?</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>7) Please clearly define the number of low emission vehicles that are going to be introduced in pilot cities.</p> <p>8) Please clarify how many charging stations will be developed</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>due to GEF investment.</p> <p>9) Outputs c-g seem to duplicate with outputs in component 1 and 2. For example, The output of "assessment of consumer demand, route structures leading to route rationalization and service planning" seems to duplicate with component 1's output on resident needs assessment. The output of " assessment and development of viable financing and business models to supply vehicles, operations and maintenance" seems to duplicate with component 1's "funding strategy".</p> <p>10) Component 3 is labeled as "investment", while main outputs in component 3 are about assessments and studies.</p> <p>11) Overall, component 3 does not provide a clear picture of what kind of investment GEF grant will support.</p> <p>XT, March 23, 2016:</p> <p>1) Comment cleared.</p> <p>2) Please briefly list the key findings that "were taken into account during development of this PIF." It is currently not self-evident where urban land use has been incorporated as a design factor.</p> <p>3) Your definition of "low</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>emission modes of transport" suggests that non-motorized transport is an important mode of urban mobility. The proposed project however exclusively focuses on EVs. The rationale is not clear.</p> <p>4) Comment cleared.</p> <p>5) The scenario of having Bhutan Government develop guidelines and standards intended to foreign manufacturers and distributors is only remotely possible. It is definitely not a constructive way to use GEF grant. Please delete this component and use the money to the investment component.</p> <p>6) What is the "existing technical training curricular of agencies such as the GNHC and DTESD"? Is it relevant to low-emission transport systems? Further, what are the main missions of government agencies like GNHC and DTESD? Is "executing training" an integrated part of their mission? Overall, please adjust the grant size for component 2 and streamline activities in the component.</p> <p>7) Please clearly quantify the output at the CEO endorsement stage. Comment cleared</p> <p>8) Please clearly quantify the output at the CEO endorsement stage. Comment cleared</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>9) Output 3(a) "introduction of low emission vehicles for mass transit system" is obviously contradictory to the RGoB's plan of "considering public taxi fleet as core target for initial investment and demo under this component" (paragraph 4, page 11). Taxi is the opposite of mass transit. Please clearly think through the outputs in component 3.</p> <p>10) Please refer to comment 9 and clearly articulate what the project aims to achieve in terms of investment.</p> <p>11) Comment is not addressed.</p> <p>XT, May 16, 2016:</p> <p>2) Key findings are provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>5) Comment is addressed.</p> <p>9) Clarification is provided. Comment addressed.</p> <p>10) Comment addressed.</p> <p>11) Comment addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: Yes.	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Availability of Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of 	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: N/A	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	XT, Jan. 25, 2016: N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>XT, Jan. 25, 2016: No. The project requires major modifications.</p> <p>XT, March 23, 2016: No. The project hasn't addressed all the comments. Recommend a phone consultation to clarify any questions before the agency resubmits the project. Also, please check the PPG financing amount to ensure consistency with GEF guidance.</p> <p>XT, May 16, 2016: Yes. The project is recommended for PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	January 25, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 23, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.