



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

GEF ID:	5105		
Country/Region:	Tunisia		
Project Title:	Addressing Climate Change Vulnerabilities and Risks in Vulnerable Coastal Areas of Tunisia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4697 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,500,000
Co-financing:	\$55,165,000	Total Project Cost:	\$60,665,000
PIF Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Keti Chachibaia (LECRD)

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Tunisia is a non-annex I party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An OFP endorsement letter dated August 17, 2012 is attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. The UNDP has a comparative advantage in integrated policy development, capacity building and institutional strengthening. The UNDP is also a strategic partner of the Ministry of Environment and Coastal Protection and Planning Agency (APAL).	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The project is aligned with UNDP's strategy for Tunisia, which aims to strengthen public institutions, civil	

		The size and the capacity of the country team seem adequate for the project operations.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes. The requested grant is within the resources available from the SCCF-Adaptation window.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 objectives.	
	9. 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?	Yes. The project proposes to address risks related to sea level rise and coastal development, which have been identified as top priority in the National Communications of Tunisia. National Development plan also highlights the need to integrate climate change effects into land and water management.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		

Project Design	<p>11. 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>	<p>Yes. Coastal areas in Tunisia are rich in natural resources, consist of economically important infrastructure and provide access to external markets. Increasing population pressure in already densely populated coastal areas and expanding industries along the coastline are stated to be baseline issues.</p> <p>Sea level rise(SLR), unpredictability in rainfall and salinization are stated as the most important climate change risks. These climate risks are exacerbated by coastal erosion and shoreline retreat induced by human disturbances.</p> <p>"National Programme for Coastal Erosion Protection" forms the baseline of the proposed LDCF project. The baseline project aims to implement hard engineering measures to protect 14 highly vulnerable tourism beaches.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes. The focus of the baseline project is solely on hard engineering solutions against coastal erosion. However, for a long term solution for coastal protection integration of climate change projections and consideration of all suitable measures is necessary.</p> <p>The proposed project will develop a) conditions suitable to support proactive management of climate risks b) expertise and knowledge necessary for</p>	

		technical capacity for long term climate solutions d) financial incentive that support adaptation measures	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Yes. The project is composed of three complimentary components namely,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Enabling policy and institutional frameworks -Implementation of adaptation measures -Provision of economic incentives <p>The expected outputs and outcomes are appropriate.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. The applied methodology is appropriate to determine adaptation benefits of the project.	
	16. 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 for PIF stage. The project focuses on highly populated and economically vital coastal areas in Tunisia. In order to make necessary adjustments in existing coastal policies and practices, government institutions, private sector and populations will be provided with necessary assistance. At least 150,000 coastal inhabitants will benefit from the project. However role of the communities and specifically, role of women in the targeted private and public sectors is not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO endorsement: Please provide information on the project aspects that will specifically address needs of vulnerable groups especially women. Also provide information on community involvement in the project.</p>	

	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Involvement of national level institutions and their roles are clear. However, the role of the communities and organizations in different project components and their level of engagement is not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on roles the local communities and organizations have in the project components.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Insufficient institutional engagement and resistance among stakeholders are stated as main risks and appropriate mitigation measures for the PIF stage is given.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement: Please investigate risks associated in achieving adequate community involvement, conducting cost benefit analysis and proof of viability of alternative measures of coastal protection.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. The proposal outlines in detail coordination with another UNDP project on coastal development.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement: Please provide similar details on collaboration opportunities with other agencies and NGOs activities indentified in the proposal.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>Not Clear. Role of Ministry of Environment and Coastal Planning and Protection Agency as the Executing Agency is understood. However.</p>	

		<p>bodies is unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please identify and provide information on roles of different executing partners.</p> <p>9/21/2012 JS Yes. Various executing partners have been identified and their roles are described. It is suggested to clearly identify the institution/s who would implement component 2 of the project.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Requested PMC is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes for PIF stage.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The National Government, multilateral agency (KFW) and UNDP are providing co-financing for the proposed project. The total estimated co-financing is \$54.1 million.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	No. The UNDP is bringing \$120,000 to the project. The agency co-financing is not reflective of its leading role in the project.	

		additional avenues of UNDP's contribution towards the project. 9/21/2012 JS It is indicated that more resources will be contributed through the UNDP towards the project. Total of \$1.165M will be contributed.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this stage. Please provide adequate responses for 20 and 26. 9/21/2012 JS Yes. Responses provided for sections 20 and 26 are sufficient and clear.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Comments for sections 16, 17, 18, 19 and 29.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 11, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 21, 2012	

	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>Not clear. The proposed preparation activities are appropriate. The preparation activities build on vulnerability assessments completed by AAP and will focus on targeted analysis for the project. Resources will be targeted to determine risks that existing infrastructure face and design measures that need to be integrated in the planning developments to avert climate risks. Stakeholders and their roles in the project will be consulted thoroughly.</p> <p>However it is not clear if the PPG will be used to produce a project baseline indicators and results framework as suggested in AMAT.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please clarify the use of GEF proposed the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT).</p> <p>9/21/2012 JS As a part of the baseline studies AMAT indicators will be selected.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The itemized budget is justified and consultant rates (Local and international) are appropriate.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. Please see section 1.</p> <p>9/21/2012</p> <p>Yes</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 11, 2012
	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.