

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: Tunisia
 Project Title: Tunisia: MENARID Ecotourism and Conservation of Desert Biodiversity
 GEFSEC Project ID: **4035**
 GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: World Bank
 GEF Focal Area (s): Multi Focal Area
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): BD-1;BD-2;LD-1;
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG: \$200,000 GEF Project Allocation: \$4,272,300 Co-financing: \$4,788,000 Total Project Cost: \$9,260,300
 PIF Approval Date: August 24, 2009 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: November 12, 2009
 Program Manager: Mohamed Bakarr GEF Agency Contact Person: Song Li

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	August 14, 2009 Yes, Tunisia is an eligible Country.	6-20-12 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		NA
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	August 14, 2009 Yes, the OFP letter is included in the submission. However an updated version will be required at CEO Endorsement to make sure the RAF allocation is consistent with amount in the project document.	6-20-12 As indicated at PIF stage, please provide a revised letter of endorsement reflecting the right focal areas and the amounts. July 16, 2012 A correct LoE is now included. Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	August 14, 2009 BD1, BD2, LD-SP1, and LD-SP3	6-20-12 Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative	August 14, 2009	6-20-12

	advantage for the project?	Yes the World Bank has a long history of supporting biodiversity conservation and land management initiatives in the country.	Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAF allocation? 	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes, the RAF allocation is confirmed and the project is a child of the MENARID programmatic approach.</p>	<p>6-20-12</p> <p>Tunisia is using BD \$3,214,530 and LD\$1,485,000. These numbers are the same as at PIF approval. Please note that in Part II.D, page 11 of CEO endorsement, it is Tunisia's "RAF" allocation and not "STAR".</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>This has been corrected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal areas? 	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>BD allocation confirmed and LD funding is through the MENARID programmatic approach.</p>	<p>6-20-12</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic objectives? 	N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic program? 	N/A	NA
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes. The project will pursue an integrated approach to biodiversity conservation and combating land degradation across targeted landscapes. This will lead to stabilization of ecosystem services and increase resilience in the fragile desert habitats, in addition to economic and human livelihood opportunities.</p>	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		<p>6-20-12</p> <p>From the BD perspective, the project should result in the improved management of three (3) National Parks - Jbil NP, Dghoumes NP</p>

			<p>and Bouhedma NP -through Management Plans prepared using a participatory approach and are adopted by key stakeholders. In the results framework, please indicate baseline and target for increased management effectiveness. From the SLM perspective, the GEBs and measures are not explicitly reflected in project design. Please address this in relation to project framework outcomes, outputs and activities.</p> <p>July 27, 2012</p> <p>The GEBs are now clear and reflect consistency with the integrated approach to management of the PAs and adjacent lands. From the BD perspective, however, the increases and targets for the METTs are very high: i) 33 points for Jbil NP (from 47 to 80), ii) 11 points for Dghoumes NP from 63 to 74 and iii) 32 points for Bouhedma NP (from 64 to 96). Achieving these increases will be very costly since it implies interventions within and outside the PAs. It is not clear how the amount allocated will make it happen given that Component 1 also includes activities under SLM. Please clarify this further as appropriate.</p> <p>August 16, 2012</p> <p>The METT scores have been adjusted and a generic table of activities included to highlight interventions that will contribute to the proposed increases. We expect that a more specific set of interventions targeted for each protected area and adjacent landscapes will be determined once the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>project gets underway. This should be reflected in PIRs and mid-term reports that will be submitted to GEF as part of the annual monitoring review.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</p>	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes. The proposed integrated ecosystem management approach is consistent with the challenges presented. The approach to linking protected area management, ecotourism, natural resource management, and community development is still innovative in desert biomes. The project design and framework is sufficiently clear and will lead to outputs of local, national and global relevance. In order to ensure coherence and effective coordination, it is recommended that the number of components be reduced to four (plus project management) during project preparation. One option toward achieving this is by integrating component 5 (community outreach and private sector development) into component 2 and 3.</p>	<p>6-20-12</p> <p>We thank the Agency for simplifying the logical framework. The number of components was reduced from 6 to 2, not to 4 as suggested.</p> <p>1) A consequence of such drastic reduction is that the LD focus was reduced to just one outcome (#3) under component 1, with no corresponding outputs to justify investment of the focal area resources. In its current version, the project has a BD focus, with emphasis on protected area management planning and the enabling environment. In the PIF, activities were devoted to Integrated Nature Resource Management and SLM best practices associated to productive agriculture and rangeland management systems in the main arid Provinces of the country. These activities were bringing essential aspects of sustainability, resilience, and agro-biodiversity. In the project framework, please provide details on SLM activities linked to SP1 (Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management) and SP3 (Investing in New and Innovative Approaches in Sustainable Land Management) to justify use of the LD resources.</p> <p>2) The breakdown of resources between the two components implies that \$2.2 million</p>

			<p>will go toward enabling conditions (training and planning) while only \$1.8 million is proposed for implementation on the ground. Please consider adjusting this breakdown to direct at least half or more of the GEF resources, toward the ground activities.</p> <p>3) The training activities in the Component 1 (600 persons trained in PA management, ecotourism development, and environmental education) implies a potential increase in stakeholders engaged in the sector. Similarly, 160 jobs linked to PAs is targeted under Component 2. Please confirm how the increase in stakeholder engagement will be sustained by the sector.</p> <p>4) Since two management plans exist and are under revision, and the management plan for the more recent park (Doughmes) is under preparation, please, explain the added value of the GEF on this activity.</p> <p>5) Please explain the nature and objective of the 12 agreements to be signed between the targeted NPs and Park and non-profit associations.</p> <p>6) Please explain the nature and objective of the 134 subprojects (for-profit and not-for-profit) to be supported by the project, and include Technical note on the small grants facility highlighted on page 37 of PAD.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>The LD focal area agenda is now more adequately reflected in the project design, including consistency with outcomes and</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>outputs. Stakeholder training and capacity building has been clarified with respect to sustainability of project outcomes. GEF value-added is now more clearly articulated on the basis of integrating management of PAs and adjacent landscapes through participatory processes that involved agreements with local communities. This is also reinforced by proposed investments in community-based activities and enterprises that will create jobs and generate income in the context of global environment benefits. A technical note is included in the proposal to explain how the small grants investment will work in this regard.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?</p>	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>6-20-12</p> <p>Please include the name of the EXECUTING PARTNER(S) in the CEO Endorsement cover (DGEQV, DGF, ONTT). Related to this, please clarify the leadership of the Ministry of Environment in this project where the three NP are under the DGF's mandate.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>Role and importance of the MoE through its DGEQV has been clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes, but links and alignments need to be elaborated during project preparation. One particular alignment of crucial relevance is the GEF-finance LADA project, for which Tunisia is a pilot country. The methodologies being developed and applied at multiple scales</p>	<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The proposed project EOs in the table showing the alignment with MENARID outcomes (p.12-13) are not consistent with the priorities of the GEF focal areas : 1) Why are hectares under higher METT scores equated as hectares under SLM</p>

		will help establish baselines and indicators for monitoring project impact and environmental benefits.	<p>investments? 2) Similarly, why is the number of INRM practices disseminated equated with staff trained? Please, revise this table once the logical framework will have been revised.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>The resubmission now includes outcomes that are clearly consistent and appropriately aligned with the MENARID Program, and in accordance with GEF focal area priorities.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes. The institutional framework for implementation will enhance long-term sustainability of the interventions. A more detailed assessment of cost-effectiveness will be undertaken during project preparation.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>Please see item 10.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>Cost-effectiveness is now sufficiently demonstrated based on proposed role of the MoE and its DGEQV.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		<p>6-20-12</p> <p>The number of technical components was reduced from 6 to 2. One of the results of this change is that the LD funded activities are inadequately reflected and therefore question the INRM approach of the project.</p>

			<p>These activities and related outputs and outcomes need to be reinstated. See comments and suggestions under item 9.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>The revised document now reflects a more clear evidence for the INRM approach, which also takes into account SLM priorities in the targeted geographies.</p>
	<p>14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?</p>	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The CC risk mitigation measures are not clear. Given that this is an arid region, please provide a more clear explanation of how CC risks are reflected in the project design, especially in relation to human and biophysical vulnerabilities in the target areas.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>Mitigating CC risks will be a key part of project intervention, including stakeholder training and investments.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
<p>Justification for GEF Grant</p>	<p>15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes. GEF resources will be crucial for facilitating the integrated and coordinated approach that is inherent in the design.</p>	<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The incremental reasoning is no longer clear relative to the design now presented. While 2/3 of the co-financing is coming from the Government, this is no clear explanation as to what was being programmed and planned for these resources to justify the GEF increment. Please provide a clear reasoning for the GEF value-added. Furthermore, the "Private Sector" is mentioned throughout the project, it is not clear how it will be engaged in this</p>

			<p>project. Does the project aim at involving the domestic or international private sector? Is the PPP for eco-tourism based on sound studies and previous experiences or is this an idea to be tested afresh?</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>The GEF value-added is now clear and justified through incremental reasoning. Focus on PPP has been removed to avoid confusion with the proposed enterprised-based small grants investments, which is intended to promote development of local enterprises in ecotourism related activities as a means of generating income. Private sector engagement will be considered as part of the broader ecotourism strategy for the three targeted NPs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?</p>	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes. GEF financing will be catalytic.</p>	<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The catalytic nature of GEF financing needs to be revisited, especially in light of breakdown for proposed BD and LD activities. Please clearly state the expected outputs and outcomes for LD to properly evaluate the appropriateness of the GEF investments.</p> <p>July 27, 2012</p> <p>The outcomes and outputs for LD are now clear and based on the integrated approach. In this regard, GEF financing and level of concessionality is now appropriate. However, there are inconsistencies in breakdown of resources for Components 1 and 2 between the Request for CEO</p>

			<p>Endorsement (Results Framework) and the PAD (p. 8-9 and p. 29-31). Please correct this.</p> <p>August 16, 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The GEBs associated with this project will take longer to deliver.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>The amount is high (13.4%) and needs to be adjusted to less than 10% at CEO Endorsement, and co-financing should also be increased.</p>	<p>6-25-12</p> <p>Management costs is now far under 10 percent.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>Yes, but please specify number of vehicles and estimated cost to give a sense of how much of the GEF PMC funding will go toward the purchase.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>Vehicle costs and funding level have been justified. Given that co-financing for this component of the PMC is significant, no additional GEF funds are associated with operation of the vehicles.</p>
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Government contribution is significant, but efforts should be made by the agency and implementing partners to increase co-</p>	

		<p>financing for baseline investments. It is recommended that a ratio of GEF resources to co-financing be on the order of at least 1:2 at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>Although still below the 1:2 ratio, the co-financing level is appropriate for the project approach.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The cofinancing ratio proposed in this current project document (1:1) is far under the ratio of 1:2 requested at PIF level (see cell 26). Please revisit this request at PIF stage and address accordingly, or elaborate further (page 21-22 of CEO document) why the 1:2 ratio is not attainable.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>The revised document provides a clear explanation as to why the government is not able to provide co-financing beyond the level already committed. The outcomes and outputs for each component have been streamlined on the basis of total funding available.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The M&E Plan is described, but lacks</p>

			<p>budgeted details. Please address and provide more link to Annex 1 and in relation to the project results framework.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>The budgeted M&E framework is now included, with clear links to project indicators and targets.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	Please respond when received.	<p>6-25-12</p> <p>STAP concerns about weakness of cross-cutting interventions, measurement of GEBs, and SLM&W practices have not been adequately addressed in the CEO Endorsement or PAD. Please provide explicit details on these in the both documents as they are reflected in the project design.</p> <p>July 16, 2012</p> <p>GEBs for BD will be tracked through the the focal area tracking tool (including the METT), while LD benefits will be based on area covered by piloting and scaling-up of SLM techniques.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	Convention Secretariat	Please respond when received.	No comments on file
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>The following concerns have not been adequately addressed as reflected in items 3, 8-17, 20, 22 and 24 above:</p> <p>1. Number of components be reduced - the extreme tightening did not streamline the</p>

			<p>design to reflect an INRM approach</p> <p>2. Co-financing be increased from the current indicative level to at least a 1:2 ratio - the ratio is still 1:1</p> <p>3. Further elaboration of links to other initiatives, particularly LADA - no explicit links are made to other projects, including other GEF projects under implementation in the country</p> <p>July 27, 2012</p> <p>These concerns have now been addressed, but further clarification is needed on #8.</p>
	Agencies' response to Council comments		No comments on file
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>Yes, the PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.	<p>August 14, 2009</p> <p>The following items must be addressed during project preparation and before CEO Endorsement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of components be reduced 2. Co-financing be increased from the current indicative level to at least a 1:2 ratio 3. Further elaboration of links to other initiatives, particularly LADA 4. Reduce project management costs to under 10% of total GEF grant 5. Revised OFP letter of endorsement for RAF allocation 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		<p>6-25-12</p> <p>No. Please review outstanding issues in items 3, 8-17, 20, 22 and 24.</p>

			7-25-12 No. Please review outstanding issued in items 8 & 17 August 20, 2012 Yes, CEO endorsement is now recommended.
Review Date	1 st review	August 14, 2009	June 25, 2012
	2 nd review		July 27, 2012
	3 rd review		August 20, 2012

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	March 17, 2010 Yes Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	March 17, 2010 Yes, and all costed activities are carefully detailed. Cleared
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	March 17, 2010 Yes Cleared
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	March 17, 2010

		<p>The PPG request is technically sound and fully justified. Unfortunately, there are no longer funds available under BD and LD to cover the requested amount. I therefore recommend that the Agency works with the Government of Tunisia to find other means of financing the PPG.</p> <p>April 21, 2010</p> <p>The PPG request was re-submitted for consideration after funds became available. It is now being recommended for approval.</p>
Other comments		
Review Date	1 st review	March 17, 2010
	2 nd review	April 21, 2010
	3 rd review	

wb21049
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM