



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5046		
Country/Region:	Tunisia		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Tunisia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4851 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$220,000
Co-financing:	\$100,400	Total Project Cost:	\$320,400
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	7-30-12 Yes. Tunisia is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	7-30-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated April 22, 2012 for \$242,000. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	7-30-12 Yes. UNDP assisted Tunisia developing the existing NBSAP and the 1 st and 3 ^{er} National Reports. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	7-30-12 UNDP has a country-office in Tunisia with one professional in charge of environmental issues. The country-office has the support of the regional office in Bratislava, Slovakia.

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	7-30-12 Yes. The EA is for \$220,000 + \$22,000 for Agency fee. Cleared
	• the STAR allocation?	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	7-30-12 Yes. The EA is for \$220,000 + \$22,000 for Agency fee. Cleared
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	7-30-12 Yes. Cleared
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	7-30-12 Yes. BD-5, Outcome 5.1. Cleared
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	7-30-12 Yes. See details on p.6. Cleared
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	7-30-12 Yes. See details on p.8-9. Cleared
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	7-30-12 Yes. The project has the following components: 1. Stocktaking and national target setting in response to the Aichi Targets by end of 2014. 2. NBSAP update by early 2014. 3. National frameworks for NBSAP implementation, CBD reporting and exchange mechanisms including a working CHM and the 5 th National Report by mid 2014. Cleared
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	7-30-12 Yes. See details on p.19. Cleared
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration,	7-30-12 Yes. See details on p.19.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	their role identified and addressed properly?	Cleared
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	7-30-12 Yes. See details on p.16-17. Cleared
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	7-30-12 Yes. The Ministry of Environment (MoE) will be the executing agency. There will be a National Project Steering Committee (PSC) and a Project Coordinator reporting to the PSC. Cleared
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	7-30-12 Yes. PM cost is 10% of GEF funding. Co-financing ratio for PM is 1:3 Cleared.
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	7-30-12 Yes, assuming the co-financing (50% in-kind contribution from Government) becomes effective during project implementation. Cleared
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	7-30-12 Yes. The co-financing ratio is 1:0.5. Cleared
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	7-30-12 Yes. The Agency is providing 50% of the co-financing all in cash. Cleared
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	7-30-12 Yes. This EA is recommended for approval. Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review**	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.