

# The agri-food industrial cold chain in Tunisia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**  
12315  
**Countries**  
Tunisia  
**Project Name**  
The agri-food industrial cold chain in Tunisia  
**Agencies**  
UNDP  
**Date received by PM**  
3/30/2026  
**Review completed by PM**  
  
**Program Manager**  
Remy Ruat  
**Focal Area**  
Climate Change  
**Project Type**  
MSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/14/2026)

Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. Please include in Portal the full name of the executing partner included in the Letter of Endorsement (The National Agency for Energy Conservation) - currently there is an acronym (ANME), that does not match the initials of the executing partner in English.

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

Thank you. The name has been corrected.

**Reference :** GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE

**2. Project Summary**

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (4/29/2026):

Clear summary.

Thank you for updating the summary as needed in case of change following response to questions below.

Agency's Comments

**3 Indicative Project Overview**

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (4/29/2026):

Clear objective, sound logical framework. Please see follow up comments below

Agency's Comments

**Response:** Follow-up comments addressed where appropriate.

**Reference :** Where applicable

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

## Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

Noted. A typo inserted itself, reference is made to gender "quality" - it seems equality was meant.

RR (4/29/2026):

1. There is scope to better reflect gender dimensions throughout project design, as this is currently absent - this is noted as a topic for assessment during PPG - thank you for reflecting this at CEO ER stage throughout project description/rationale.

2. Beyond gender-sensitive KM, Agency is requested to also capture lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment and implementing gender-responsive actions/gender mainstreaming, and ensure wide dissemination of such products

## Agency's Comments

**Response:** 1. Noted, as indicated already, this will be addressed during the PPG and at CEO ER stage.

2. Noted and agreed. The project framework and narrative have been updated to ensure that lessons learned and best practices regarding gender equality and women's empowerment are systematically captured and widely disseminated.

## **Reference :**

No changes

Indicative project overview and the project description section.

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

## Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. GEF Resources allocated to PMC are 5.58%, but the cap for projects above \$2 million is 5% - please amend.

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

Thank you, fixed at 5%

**Reference:** Indicative Project Overview Table

**4 Project Outline**

**A. Project Rationale**

**4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (4/29/2026):

This is a robust situation analysis. Thank you for the provided details.

Agency's Comments

**4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

1. Cleared

2. Noted - resilience/adaptive management approach to be elaborated on at CEO ER.

3 Cleared

#### 4. Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. Could you please include in the description of baseline initiatives the recently approved project on cooling by the Multilateral Fund (please see quick follow up summary in item 5.2 below)? Clarification on articulation with this project would be expected in more details at CEO ER stage, but a short/broad description of what it includes would help complete the picture and understand areas where the present project will complement.
2. The description of futures scenarios is missing a short description of how exogenous drivers of relevance to the project are expected to evolve, such as climate risks, consumption patterns, price/market signals - to inform the resilience based / adaptive management design of the project (the latter part would be an additional sentence under the "enduring outcome" paragraph).
3. The "Landscape of Investments" section should be moved to the baseline section, just before the barrier assessment list. response to question1 above can also be included there.
4. There are a number of sub-sections that would need to be moved / consolidated into the project description/theory of change
  - > content under "Key drivers of transformational change" and "adopting a cold chain approach" (including the figure) would be better placed under the theory of change to clarify the project approach
  - > "stakeholder engagement" details, as they relate to project implementation, not to the landscape of the sector.

#### Agency's Comments

##### **Response:**

1. The project is already listed in Table 3 ? Tunisia MLF funding for ongoing projects. A short reference and description of the project have been included.
2. Text added in the section on future scenarios. Sentence added in paragraph on Enduring Outcomes.
3. Section has been moved to the suggested place just before the barrier assessment list. Response to question 1, to include reference to recently approved MLF project, is reflected here
4. Suggested content sections have been moved/integrated into the theory of change section.

##### **Reference :**

In the baseline section. Page 12.  
In the baseline section. Page 12.  
Baseline section. Future narratives and system dynamics.  
ToC subsection.

#### **5 B. Project Description**

##### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

1. Noted

2. Cleared

3. Cleared

4. Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. References are made in the rationale of options related to vehicle modernization - in case this is considered among the pilots, please ensure to consider vehicles that are not powered by fossil fuels

2. Please ensure during project design that interventions reflect a balance between energy efficiency/sufficiency and related new technologies (which is expected to be the major share of activities), and switching to renewables.

3. Output 1.1 entails the development of a dedicated roadmap for the sector - is there no risk of redundancy with the recently approved national cooling roadmap?

4. In output 1.2, will the policy gap assessment also include assessment of possible policies/regulations/institutional arrangements in other sectors that may constitute barriers to deployment (e.g. policy coherence)?

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

1. The project will focus on the segment of the transport fleet that is currently actively refrigerated (about 3,000 vehicles, based on the data available). These vehicles are entirely fueled by fossil fuels (mostly diesel). The project will support and pilot energy efficiency measures, as presented in the various options for technological improvements, that will result in a reduction of diesel consumption, which is the main source of emissions. While the widespread adoption of electric refrigerated trucks and vans faces significant cost barriers in the Tunisian context, the project will remain open to exploring EV options for new vehicles where technically and financially feasible, and will seek to incorporate such opportunities as they emerge during implementation.

2. Comment is well noted, and UNDP will ensure that this will be the case. This will be captured in the ToR for the design team to be engaged during the PPG.

3.To avoid this potential risk, the project is closely coordinating with the NCAP, and its funding is co-financing for our project. Our project has a narrower focus (agri-food industrial cold chain) than the NCAP and complements the NCAP with a more detailed and deeper road map specifically for this cold chain. Further, UNDP is one of the co-chairs of the Working Group on NCAPs under the UNEP-initiated Cool Coalition, ensuring close coordination between the two initiativeS.

4.Yes, policy coherence is an important requirement for the assessment. Text was added to clarify that.

**Reference :**

No changes.

No changes.

Output 1.2 description

**5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING**

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

1. Noted - to be followed up at CEO ER stage.

RR (4/29/2026):

1. Please see question above about Multilateral Fund projects recently approved

- our understanding is that the project approved at the 97th meeting focused on improving the energy efficiency of residential AC manufactured in the country, strengthening the MEPS for residential AC, and upgrading a local laboratory to test the energy efficiency of RAC equipment based on flammable refrigerants. Would be useful to clarify if the present project would include funding related to testing of equipment ; and that the project approved at the 94th meeting included activities related to development of MEPS for small refrigeration and air-conditioning (RAC) devices and for large installations, including inspection system; development of energy labelling for small RAC appliances, in line with the MEPS; updating training programmes and undertaking trainings; and a variety of awareness-raising activities.

- but it seems overlap should be limited given the difference in segment (agri-food cold chain)

- please ensure during ppg that related outputs like 1.4 are complementary

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

We have the same understanding, and we have cross-checked internally with our team working on the MLF. The present project may provide funding for any additional testing if the detailed design to be done under the PPG identifies such a need. There is only one certified testing laboratory in Tunisia, the CETIME calorimetric laboratory, so any additional testing would be

conducted by this lab. We note that overlap with the recently approved MLF project is highly unlikely, given the very different segment of the market (residential air conditioning) from the current project, which focuses on the agri-food cold chain. The work on these topics is effectively coordinated in Tunisia, both between implementing agencies (UNIDO and UNDP) and through the national Ozone focal point. Any potential work on MEPS under the current project (at this stage, we cannot exclude this; if the PPG design identifies specific needs, we would include this in the project) will be carefully planned to avoid any overlaps and to instead enhance synergies and complementarity (especially in outputs 1.2 and 1.4).

**Reference :**

No changes

**5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. Please see comments above

Agency's Comments

**Response:** All comments above have been carefully reviewed, and the necessary clarifications have been provided.

**Reference :**

No changes

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

1. Noted - the term attribution factor is not appropriate in this case, as this is a direct emission reductions estimate based on past similar investment performance, with a pro-rata applied to reflect the size of the present investment. At CEO ER stage, please revise the methodology to reflect the content of the proposed activities/investments if possible using a bottom-up approach.

2. Well noted and we appreciate the conservative approach.

3. Noted

RR (4/29/2026):

Core indicator estimate seems conservative given level of investment and targeted activities.

1. It seems also a bit confusing, as a top down attribution factor based on a sectoral potential is used for the calculation of direct emission reductions - normally this would be used only for indirect emission reductions for policy/TA effect, but this project will support investments also. Could you please clarify?

2. Noted that two additional emission sources not yet quantified, i.e., decentralized solar cold storage at the farm collection stage and emissions avoided through reductions in food loss. We would expect the latter (especially indirect) to be quite significant. Is there no interim estimate available?

3. Indicator 6.3 is not filled, which seems counterintuitive for an energy efficiency focused project - is there an interim estimate available?

## Agency's Comments

### **Response:**

1. Indeed, there was a small mistake in the numbers. The emission reduction estimates for the EE and RE interventions are based on energy audits undertaken in specific companies and are fairly accurate. These represent what we believe to be achievable direct emission reductions. These totals are not to be confused with sector potential, which is larger. However, the estimate for the planned emission reduction from the transport link of the transport chain is only a rough estimate based on available, but dated, data on the transport fleet of refrigerated trucks. The project will only focus on existing actively refrigerated vehicles and aims to introduce efficiency measures. The estimate presented is the total potential if all vehicles are covered by the project. We do not think this is feasible; a conservative factor of 20% was applied to these emissions only. We have recalculated the total direct emission reduction to be 275,180 tCO<sub>2</sub> over 20 years. These corrections have been made in the main section of the PIF as well as in the detailed GHG annex (Annex G)

2. We could make some assumptions to get a sense of the potential size of the reductions at this stage, but we would recommend leaving this to be done during the PPG. There is limited value in adding very soft estimates at this stage, which may prove incorrect and be entirely based on hypothetical models. The estimate for the project total given in the previous question is quite robust and considered to be a conservative floor. The actual emission reduction of the project is very likely to exceed this, especially when adding in the numbers for the last two sources of emission reduction during the PPG phase

3. Left empty in the portal by mistake. This indicator is filled. The value for indicator 6.3 - Energy saved in megajoules ? is 40,338,000.

**Reference :**

Figures were updated where applicable.

No changes.

Updated in the portal.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**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, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Yes. risk is consistent with ESS rating

Agency's Comments

**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Commentssee above

Agency's Comments

**Response:** All comments above were addressed as requested.

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

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

1. The below information seems relevant to explore further during PPG and to integrate at CEO ER stage in the baseline, also given that this may be one of the expected impact area of the project (see above). We also do not see a clear rationale for not identifying contribution to target 16 (other GEF projects without BD core indicators but targeting food waste usually report this) - but this can also be added at CEO ER.

RR (4/29/2026):

1. This project has relevance for target 16 of the GBF (on sustainable consumption, halving of food waste) - could you please update accordingly

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

This project is ?not aiming to generate biodiversity benefits?, which is why this was not addressed. The project is, however, well aligned with target 16, which includes ?halving of food waste?. The project could contribute to this because increased and more efficient use of cooling in the agri-food industrial cold chain will result in a reduction in food loss. Data for Tunisia are hard to come by. In the UNEP 2021 assessment (Food Waste Index Report 2021), household food waste for Tunisia is estimated at 91 kg/capita/year, or the equivalent of 1,064,407 tonnes per year. This estimate is, however, considered to be ?very low confidence?. In addition, food waste also occurs in the food service and the retail sector. No estimates are available for these. Our project targets specifically the agri-food industrial cold chain, not the household sector.

**Reference :**

No changes

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

##### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

#### **8 Annexes**

##### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 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):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's CommentsCleared

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's CommentsCleared

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

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's CommentsPPG 100,000

Agency's Comments

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. Please disaggregate the line on "Technical and financial partners such as AfDB, IKI, GIZ, GCF, and others" to reflect only those who are clearly identified and already engaged (with a name) at this stage, and provide explanation in the text below the table.

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

The comment has been addressed as requested. The reference to ?technical and financial partners has been disaggregated to include only partners that are clearly identified and already

engaged at this stage. Additional explanatory text has also been included in the table to clarify the respective roles and contributions of the identified partners.

**Reference:** Indicative Co-financing Table

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

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 Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/14/2026)

Cleared

RR (4/29/2026):

1. do you have tentative geo coordinates?

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

No, not yet, since the sites for demonstration and piloting actions by the project have not been chosen yet. During the PPG, more details can be provided on geo coordinates once the sites are known.

**Reference :**

No Changes

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex E: Rio Markers**

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

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/29/2026):

Cleared

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project 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. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/14/2026)

Comments have been addressed. project recommended for clearance.

RR (4/29/2026):

Could you please see comments above and resubmit

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

Comments have been addressed and are presented in this document. Changes have been made where appropriate in the PIF and highlighted in Yellow.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

1. It is noted that the document mentioned: ?a gender action plan will be formulated to translate the findings into concrete, time-bound activities with clear outputs, indicators, and responsibilities to address the challenges identified.? Agency is requested ensure that the findings from the gender analysis informs the preparation of the GAP and that these are reflected in the project components. All of the project components have relevant gender equality elements. Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

2. Please ensure conducting consultations with vulnerable groups and integrating results of consultations into the project design during PPG. Please also consider engaging with them not only as beneficiaries of the project, but also as partners of the project.

3. See other comments in review sheet above on elements to explore during PPG

Agency's Comments

**Response:**

Thank you, to be addressed in the PPG phase

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/29/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/14/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		