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

GEF ID:	**5266**		
Country/Region:	**Tunisia**		
Project Title:	**Oases Ecosystems and Livelihoods Project**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**132157 (World Bank)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2; LD-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$5,760,730**
Co-financing:	**$59,048,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$64,808,730**
PIF Approval:	**February 20, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**April 12, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mohamed Bakarr**	Agency Contact Person:	**Taoufiq Bennouna**

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?	Feb 8, 2013 Yes Tunisia is eligible. Cleared	April 21, 2014 Yes Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Feb 8, 2013 Yes, the OFP endorsement is on file. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		April 21, 2014 Yes. The project is linked directly to the MENA-DELP for which the World Bank serves as GEF Agency.

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		April 21, 2014 No Cleared
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		April 21, 2014 Yes Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project utilized $6,308,000 of Tunisia's allocation. Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project is designed as multi-focal with BD and LD. Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		n/a
	• focal area set-aside?		April 21, 2014 No set-aside funds were requested.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project is aligned with both the BD and LD focal area strategies, and demonstrates an integrated approach focusing on oases ecosystems. Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project will contribute to BD2 through mainstreaming conservation of oasis ecosystems in national sectoral policies (agriculture, tourism), and LD1 through sustainable land management of the production systems for food crops and high value commodities. Cleared
	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?		April 21, 2014 Yes, and the consistency is adequately described in the PAD. Cleared
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the emphasis on communities in this regard is particularly noteworthy, given their dependency on the oases. Cleared
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to		April 21, 2014 Yes, the baseline scenario and projects

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		provide a timely rationale for the proposed GEF project, and based on sound data and assumptions. Cleared
	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?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project builds on existing institutional framework for the baseline project, which will ensure that GEF resources are channeled directly toward generating global environment benefits. Cleared
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the GEF incremental reasoning is adequately described in the PAD. Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the framework is clear and sound. Cleared
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the GEF Incremental Cost matrix was used to provide a clear rationale for the reasoning presented. Cleared
	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		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project focuses largely on community engagement through participatory processes, including

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		considerations for gender-specific needs and priorities. Cleared
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the participatory approach facilitates engagement with all stakeholders, including CSOs. Cleared
	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)		April 21, 2014 Yes, all relevant risks have been considered and mitigation measures included. Cleared
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the project is properly coordinated with and linked directly to the MENA-DELP, which seeks to promote sustainability and resilience of desert ecosystems and local communities. Cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		April 21, 2014 Yes Cleared
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		April 21, 2014 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		April 21, 2014 PMC is considered as a separate project component, but the amount is 5% of the total GEF grant. Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the breakdown is adequate and appropriate. Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		April 21, 2014 Yes, the cofinancing letter from the Government confirms all amounts. Cleared
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		April 21, 2014 The World Bank will only provide technical support as GEF Agency, and the implementation will be led by the General Directorate for Environment and Quality of Life in the Ministry of Equipment, Territorial Management, and Sustainable Development.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		April 21, 2014 Yes, all completed TTs have been included. Cleared
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		April 21, 2014 Yes, the M&E plan is included. Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		April 21, 2014
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		April 21, 2014 Yes Cleared
	• Other GEF Agencies?		No comments received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	February 11, 2013 The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	February 11, 2013 For the full project (PAD stage), the following additional details should be addressed for GEF consideration: 1. National Strategy of Sustainable Management of Oasis Ecosystems: Detailed description of i) the activities	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		that will be carried out with the BD focal area funds toward this expected outcomes (only listed at PCN stage), ii) proposed institutional arrangements to implement the strategy, and iii) how the projects plans to ensure the institutional and financial sustainability of the project (at national level). 2. Strengthening institutional capacity: Details of specific interventions that will be carried out to strengthen the institutions and stakeholders listed under sub-component 1.2: i) National institutions (DGEQV, DGF, CRDAs). ii) local government, iii) local stakeholders. Gender considerations and role of civil society groups must be clearly articulated. 3. Participatory plans to incorporate SLM and biodiversity conservation: Details of the specific SLM and biodiversity conservation practices that will be carried out in the pilot oases (some listed at PCN stage). In the target oases, please provide information on the specific interventions to ensure the sustainability of these investments. 4. Global Environmental Benefits: Please provide specific information regarding the oases targeted for SLM and conservation interventions: these should include: i) Name, ii) location, iii) areas (ha), and iii) biodiversity values. Please describe the expected tangible and measurable GEBs derived from the implementation of the National Strategy and Participatory Plans in the pilot	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		areas, and ensure these are clearly captured in the appropriate BD and LD tracking tools that must accompany the PAD.	
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?		N/a
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		April 21, 2014 Yes, CEO endorsement of the cleared DM package is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 08, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 21, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.