

Oasis Landscape Sustainable Management project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10538

Countries

Tunisia

Project Name

Oasis Landscape Sustainable Management project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

11/23/2021

Review completed by PM

2/7/2022

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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

January 26, 2021

Addressed.

December 20, 2021

No.

You did not follow conclusions we agreed at concept level when you added one million of US\$ to the project budget. At PCN level, we actually agreed to assign a minimum of resources to the LD2.5 objective on LDN capacity building and assign more resources to the operational LD1.1 objective on agriculture (roughly with a ratio of 2:1). We recommend following the same logics with the additional one million of STAR resources: We recommend adding US\$349,557 to LD2.5 (and not LD1.1) and adding \$US949,557 to LD1.1 (and not LD2.5). We will read the following breakdown of resources:

LD1.1: \$1,899,760

LD2.5: \$949,557

BD2.7: \$803,557

It will not change the project framework, but will better fit the logics of the GEF7 LD strategy. Thanks.

Agency Response

02/1/22

thank you!

01/19/22

Agree: The project documents have been adjusted to align with the conclusions reached during the PCN and also to be consistent with the logic of the GEF LD strategy as advised. Specifically, hereunder is the breakdown of resources:

LD1.1: \$1,899,760

LD2.5: \$949,557

BD2.7: \$803,653 (this figure doesn't change).

These changes have been made in the GEF Data Sheet accordingly (see following file: 2.1_GEF7 WB Appraisal-CEO Endorsement_Approval_FSP_WAHA__11 January 2022.docx) and have also been reflected in the portal.

Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 26, 2021

Addressed.

December 20, 2021

- Project taxonomy, in the portal and the annex 7: please add the keywords: drought mitigation and early warning systems.

Agency Response

02/1/22

thank you!

01/19/2022

Agree. The proposed keywords (drought mitigation and early warning systems) have been added in the portal and in the Annex 7 (see following files: 2.1_GEF7 WB Appraisal-CEO Endorsement_Approval_FSP_WAHA__11 January 2022.docx and 5_GEF WAHA Project Taxonomy_11 January 2022.docx).

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 20, 2021

NA

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

January 26, 2021

Addressed.

December 20, 2021

- A proof of cofinancing is available, describing the contribution of the IBRD-financed Tunisia Sustainable Oasis Landscape Management with 50 million of US dollars equivalent. However, we can read in the letter that the IBRD-GEF WAHA project is expected to be approved in December 2022. Can you confirm please?

- Is the intention still to develop a blended operation? With an implementation start being January 3, 2023? Please, confirm.

Agency Response

02/1/22

thank you!

01/19/2022

Yes. We confirm that the IBRD-GEF WAHA project is expected to be approved in December 2022. In addition, we also affirm that the intention still is to develop a blended operation with an expected implementation start being January 3, 2023.

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

February 1st, 2022

Addressed.

January 26, 2021

Not addressed. We do not understand the justification given. There is no increase of the indicator 4.1 as the 5,000 ha of terrestrial landscape management to benefit biodiversity was already planned at concept stage included in the 25,000 ha under the core indicator 4. The increase of beneficiaries is welcome but does not reflect a Global Environment Benefit. Please, clarify what "preparation of specific LD and BD related inputs into full-fledged ILDPs" means.

December 20, 2021

Yes. However, with an additional one million of US\$, we would expect gains in the proposed targets under the core indicator 4.

One of the justifications given for more resources was "to increase on the ground field investments and activities for halting land degradation and foster carbon sequestration in the designated project areas". This addition should be translated by higher targets. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

02/1/22

Thanks a lot for the comment, and for giving us the opportunity to clarify. Indeed, the additional 1 million financing resources will be used to further strengthen planning and management in key oasis for more impacts and better development outcomes. Specifically, the difference that this additional US\$1m makes is that we now will have an area of 5,000 ha (within the original 25,000) where the needed conservation work will be integrated in all the other aspects of a true Landscape Management Approach through the ILDPs. We would not have been able to envisage this additional result without the additional US1m.

Furthermore, in strategic locations to be identified and selected prior to Project-launch, the Local Development Plans, the Sustainable Land Management Plans, the Economic Development Plans, the Land Use Plans and other Spatial/Territorial or Sectoral Development Plans will all be integrated as well as the conservation priorities into comprehensive and multi-sectoral Integrated Landscape Development Plans (ILDPs) to be prepared under GEF support and covering 5000 ha. Specific consultations on LD and BD related matters will inform the preparation of the ILDPs. Recommendations provided will be fully reflected in the ILDPs and translated into concrete nature based conservation and restoration actions, important for GEBs by improving the sustainability of oasis ecosystems in terms of: (i) Biodiversity (managing biodiversity in production landscapes and harnessing biodiversity for sustainable agriculture and harnessing non timber forest products); (ii) Land degradation (creating enabling environments for land degradation neutrality (LDN)); and (iii) Climate change (land-based and value chain Greenhouse Gas (GHG) mitigation, through sequestration and avoidance of emission).

Moreover, the elaborated ILDPs will be closely monitored to ensure sound implementation. Capacity building beneficial to stakeholders will be important to ensure full understanding, ownership and implementation of the ILDPs.

Finally, the additional financial support (from the US\$1 million) towards the preparation, implementation and monitoring of the ILDPs will help demonstrate the added value of the integrated landscape approach to best managed land based on a long-term collaboration among different groups of land users and stakeholders to achieve the multiple objectives required from the landscape such as SLM, Land restoration and biodiversity conservation.

01/19/2022

The PID now further clarifies that, under GEF funding is now included the preparation of specific LD- and BD-related inputs into full-fledged Integrated Landscape Development Plans (ILDPs). This will cause the increase in certifiable ?Land area under sustainable landscape management practices? from zero to 5,000 ha. For improved monitoring, we have now inserted a new intermediate results indicator along these lines in the result framework: Area under Integrated Landscape Development (Hectares)

The increase in hectares (due to the 1m increase in GEF funding) is therefore not through the overall increase of project area but rather through the increase of area under ILDP management and which will benefit to more people.

In this regard, the core indicator 11 has been increased from PIF stage to Endorsement stage from 33,798 number of direct beneficiaries to 39,798 (19 899 women 19 899 men).

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 NA

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

February 1st, 2022

Addressed above.

January 26, 2022

We saw the response from the item 5. The point is still not addressed. Please, clarify.

December 20, 2021

As highlighted under the item 6, we see that the targets under the core indicator 4, related to landscape management (25,000 ha, including 5,000 ha under 4.1 to the benefit of biodiversity and 20,000 ha under SLM), have not changed since the PCN review in April 2020. It does not seem coherent with an increase of budget of 1 million of US. Please, clarify.

January 26, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

2/01/22

Thanks for the comment.

As indicated above, the increase of budget of US\$1 million is not envisaged to translate into an increase of the total land area/geographical coverage targeted under the larger IBRD project per se. However, there is a new key objective and value addition made possible by the additional US\$ 1million, and this is the "land area under Integrated Landscape Management?". The target is to reach 5000 ha of oasis landscapes that are managed under ILDPs to be designed and implemented during project implementation.

01/19/2022

See response to item 5 above

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

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

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

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

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

December 20, 2021

Addressed. The causal-effect reasoning is better and the information on the selected landscapes - oases and rangelands - is useful.

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

December 20, 2021

Knowledge management and communication processes should enable replication and upscaling of good practices at local, national, and regional levels, including mainstreaming of opportunities to promote gender equality.

Agency Response

01/19/2022

Agreed: Areas of innovation and opportunities for and investments in knowledge management and communication are covered in the PID Annex ? project document (see file: 3.2_P169955_PID_ANNEX_PROJECT DOCUMENT_11 January 2022.docx), and annex H dedicated to Knowledge Management (see file: 10_ANNEX H - GEF WAHA Knowledge Management Strategy and Budget_22 November 2021.docx).

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

Map available.

Please, provide geographical coordinates for targeted KBAs.

April 13, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

041020

Geographical coordinates for targeted KBAs have been added to Annex A, under Map 2.

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

NA

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

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

In the GEF-WAHA Project Stakeholder Engagement Plan, there is a section describing the consultations conducted during project development in May 2019 in Tozeur and Tunis with local, national, and international stakeholders gathering respectively 40 and 30 participants. Further consultations will be held in the governorates of Gabes, Gafsa, and Kebili. Communication channels between citizens and authorities will be strengthened to give voices to beneficiaries and excluded groups (women and youth).

Agency Response thank you

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

December 20, 2021

- Yes. cf. the annex 4 on Gender analysis, implementation of gender mainstreaming and sustainability framework.

- Gender issues are mainstreamed in the result framework (cf formulation of the components 2 and 3: "promote gender-responsive sustainable investment in oasis landscapes, "Gender-responsive project coordination, M&E and communication and knowledge).
- Specific activities have been defined related to gender (training modules, gender public consultation, gender approach on local know-how and practices, e.g.).
- A gender action plan is included.
- Monitoring and reporting of gender-sensitive targets and indicators is included in the project.

Agency Response thank you
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
December 20, 2021

The information related to the private sector stays limited, notably about SMEs. However, an index will be included measuring their involvement and reinforcement (access to finance, access to markets, improved production capacity, job creation, income increase...). The private sector will be catalyzed through three windows: (i) restoring oasis ecosystem functions and carbon sequestration; (ii) supporting oases productive alliances and value chains; and (iii) developing ecotourism initiatives to support income diversification and resilience of the local populations.

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you
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
December 20, 2021

Addressed.

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

December 20, 2021

Yes. This project is developed on lessons from past GEF projects.

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you

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

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you

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

December 20, 2021

- Yes, in the sub-component 3.3 on communication and KM.
- See also the annex H on the KM strategy and approach.

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you
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
December 20, 2021

Addressed. See comments above above the targets.

Agency Response thank you
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
December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2022

- No objection about the proposed expenses under the pmc. Cleared.

February 1st, 2022

- Not addressed. The details are not provided for the pmc. The pmc column in the budget is still empty. We cannot review the pmc following the GEF policies and guidelines. Please, provide a detailed budget justifying the \$173,950.

- We take note that the cofinancing ratio is 1:13.75 for the technical components and 1:12.5 for the pmc, for a general ratio of 1:13.7. There is not a disproportionate burden on GEF resources for pmc. Cleared.

January 26, 2022

Budget

- Please, provide the details for the pmc. There is a total of \$173,950, but the column is empty. The threshold of 5% for pmc is not a due or a lumpsum and must be justified.

- Please, confirm that the gender-responsive project coordination covers different items than the pmc.

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

02/05/22

the budget table has been updated to provide expenditures details that will be covered by the pmc for an amount of \$173,950 including the following costs (updated version is inserted in the template and excel sheet is uploaded in the roadmap):

- \$73,950 : to recruit individuals (Contractual Services) to support the project management unit for the preparation and implementation of procurement plans and financial management

- \$100,000 : to strengthen staffing with the recruitment of a deputy project manager as part of the salary and benefits / Staff costs.?

02/01/22

Thanks for the question. We confirm that the gender-responsive project coordination will cover different items than the pmc.

In particular, to strengthen both the Project Management Unit (PMU at national level) and Regional PIU (at governorates level), additional financing is needed to ensure horizontal and vertical coordination, capacity building and reinforcing expertise on key topics. In particular, dedicated experts on LD and BD will be involved to ensure a sound project coordination (sub-component 3.1), seeking gender balance as well in the team composition. Supervision missions from the PIU will be realized to support project implementation at regional level. And international and local gender experts will be recruited to support the project implementation at PIU level and in support to the regional (RPIU) and local levels (beneficiaries), including delivering targeted trainings on gender aspects of socioeconomic & environmental dimensions to strengthen capacities.

Moreover, the project coordination sub-component is completed by two other sub-components related to Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Communication and knowledge management allowing reinforcing the PIU.

Considering the Project Monitoring and Evaluation (sub-component 3.2.), the M&E and learning processes will be done in a participatory manner, including full citizen engagement and gender filtering to ensure gender equality in participatory monitoring and adaptive learning. Specific tools for M&E system on LD and BD issues will be developed thanks to the GEF grant.

Under Communication and knowledge management (sub-component 3.3), a specific communication strategy and its action plan will be developed considering different stakeholders and audience, ensuring gender equality in getting access to information, knowledge and participating in decision making processes. A dedicated expert will be recruited to support the communication strategy and its action plan to be properly implemented.

Additional details about knowledge management strategy are also given in the Annex H: Elements of the Knowledge Management Strategy (see following file: 10_ANNEX H - GEF WAHA Knowledge Management Strategy and Budget_22 November 2021.docx).

Finally, we underline that the pmc ratio has been slightly reviewed in the GEF Datasheet to be fully aligned with the GEF grant / total IBRD cofinancing ratio (which is 1:12,5). See

updated GEF Appraisal-CEO endorsement Datasheet (2.1_GEF7 WB Appraisal-CEO Endorsement_Approval_FSP_WAHA__28 January 2022_VF).

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request December 20, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response thank you **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request January 26, 2021

Addressed.

December 20, 2021

- The comments are included, but the proposed table is out of the portal margins. Please, provide a different format to make the comments and the response readable.
- Comments made at PCN are available. Comments from QER could be included.

Agency Response

02/11/22

GEF Secretariat request from 02/11/22 regarding project duration and Core indicators to be included in the Project Results Framework are addressed.

01/19/2022

- The table has been formatted in word document to make the comments and the response readable.
- The table has been updated as well to include comments from QER.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request January 26, 2021

Addressed.

December 20, 2021

- The comments are included, but the proposed table is out of the portal margins. Please, provide a different format to make the comments and the response readable.

Agency Response

01/19/2022

- The table has been formatted in word document to make the comments and the response readable.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 26, 2021

Addressed.

December 20, 2021

- The comments are included, but the proposed table is out of the portal margins. Please, provide a different format to make the comments and the response readable.

Agency Response

01/19/2022

- The table has been formatted in word document to make the comments and the response readable.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 20, 2021

Addressed.

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 14, 2022

The comments are addressed. The project is recommended for technical clearance and Council consultation.

February 11, 2022.

Please, address the following comments from the Quality Control:

1. On Project Information: the duration (84 months ? 7 years) does not match the expected implementation-completion dates. Please request the agency to amend.
2. Core Indicators: Annex A ?Project Results Framework? ? could you please ask the Agency to include targets for GEF Core indicators 6 (GHG emissions mitigated) and 11 (beneficiaries disaggregated by gender) if possible at this stage.

February 7, 2022

The project is recommended for clearance (and Council consultation).

February 1st, 2022

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, check the remaining comment on the pmc budget.

January 26, 2022

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, check the items 5 and 7 (part I), as well as the budget in the annexes.

December 20, 2021

The project is not recommended for CEO endorsement yet. Please, address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/26/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/1/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/7/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations