



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	8000		
Country/Region:	Tunisia		
Project Title:	Improve Mercury Management in Tunisia		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$600,000
Co-financing:	\$2,350,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,950,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Lulwa Ali	Agency Contact Person:	Jerome Stucki, Environmental Management Branch

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?		Yes, Tunisia signed the Minamata Convention in October 2013 LA, 12/4/2014
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		Yes, Endorsement letter has been provided. LA, 12/4/2014
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		NA
	• the focal area allocation?		NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		NA

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		Yes, Grant resources are available from the chemicals and wastes Focal Area. LA, 12/4/2014
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>		Yes, the project is aligned with the CW Focal Area Program No. 4 of the Strategic Objective No.2 (i.e. Reduction or elimination of anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury to the environment). LA, 12/4/2014
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>		Yes.
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>		Yes, the baseline project is based on data and information collected from three preliminary independent assessment studies conducted at SNCPA (National Society of Cellulose and Paper Alfa) site. LA, 12/4/2014
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>		Yes, the project components, outcomes and outputs are clear and presented in a logical sequence. LA, 12/4/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		<p>Yes, the project aim to develop inventory of mercury releases in Tunisia and to conduct site characterization to determine the extent of mercury contamination. The outcomes of the project will help in finalizing the remediation plan of the site to eliminate further mercury contamination and emission to the environment.</p> <p>The GBS will also include setting an example for other countries on the benefits for implementing the Mercury Convention obligations in their respective countries.</p> <p>LA, 12/4/2014</p>
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		<p>Yes, socioeconomic benefits are described. These benefits include the reduction/ elimination of mercury health risks to humans (especially venerable women which constitute 30% of the total labor force in Tunisia as well as younger generation) and the protection of ecosystems goods and services.</p> <p>LA, 12/4/2014</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		<p>Yes, the roles and engagements of relevant public stakeholders including civil society and local community, as relevant, are explained.</p> <p>LA, 12/4/2014</p>
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,		<p>Yes, potential major risks are identified and associated mitigation measures are described including the consequence of heavy rainfall events on the site characterization work.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)		LA, 12/4/2014
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>Yes, the project is consistent and properly coordinated with SICAM and UNEP's global En. Lighten project.</p> <p>The project document also refers to a "coordination meeting" with the subcontractor of the En. Lighten Further clarifications on the outcomes of this meeting in relation to the objectives of the proposed project are recommended in the proposal document.</p> <p>LA, 12/4/2014</p> <p>LA, 12/16/2014: Clarification on the outcomes of the coordination meeting with the En. Lighten project subcontractor was provided in the revised request for CEO approval. Communication channels between the two initiatives will be established at project inception and maintained throughout project implementation to insure any overlaps between the two projects are minimized. Comment cleared.</p>
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is not innovative in merit. It is based on standard approaches and methods including developing inventory for mercury based on UNEP's toolkit; conducting gap analysis of regulatory and institutional capacity in line with the Minamata convention requirements; and investigation of the impacts on aquifer

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		<p>and adjacent ecosystem of the contaminated SNCPA site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of national mercury inventory and guidelines for Tunisia will assist in prioritizing interventions for treatment and safe disposal of mercury containing waste. These regulatory tools will also provide a policy framework for long term environmentally sound management of mercury in Tunisia. The results of this project have good potential for replication and scale up of good practices for the promotion of sound management of mercury. <p>LA, 12/4/2014</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NA- PIF is not required for MSP in GEF-6 (I step procedure)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>Yes, the project is based on two complimentary dimensions that will ensure the cost effectiveness of its outcomes. These two dimensions include developing national capacity for sound management of mercury (i.e. inventory, legal tools) and conducting mercury contaminated site characterization. The combination of these two approaches will ensure that GEF funding is effectively utilized to reduce the direct risk from the SNCPA site to human health and the environment and enhance Tunisia's regulatory framework towards environment sound management of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			mercury. LA, 12/4/2014
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		Yes, the ratio of total GEF financing to total co-financing is roughly 1:4 which is appropriate for the project. LA, 12/4/2014
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?		Yes. The project management cost is 10% of GEFTF which is consistent with GEF guidelines for projects with financing up to \$2 million. LA, 12/4/2014
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		NA
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		No.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		No. Annex C (the work plan and budget for the project monitoring and evaluation) is missing from the document submitted for CEO approval. Please provide this Annex to complete our review of the document. LA, 12/4/2014 LA, 12/16/2014: Yes, annex C was provided in the revised document for CEO approval and reviewd. The proposed M&E plan is appropriate for the project- Comment cleared.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA. STAP comments are not required for MSP in GEF-6
	• Convention Secretariat?		None received from the Conventions Secretariat.
	• The Council?		NA. The council comments are not required for MSP in GEF-6
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received from other agencies.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NA	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		No. Pending the receipt of information requested in questions 12 and 22 above. LA, 12/4/2014 Yes, all comments are cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			LA, 12/16/2014
	First review*		December 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 16, 2014
Review Date (s)	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.**