

Strengthening Tunisia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Transparency Framework

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10595

Countries

Tunisia

Project Name

Strengthening Tunisia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Transparency Framework

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/7/2022

Review completed by PM

2/27/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 21, 2022:

Yes, the project remains aligned with the PIF. Moreover, the total project cost and co-finance remain the same compared to the PIF (\$1,485,000 and \$200,000, respectively). Cleared.

Agency Response
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 21, 2022:

Yes, the project remains aligned with the PIF. We note there have been minor changes, such as changes in wording of certain project components, outcomes and outputs, as well as the distribution of budget among project components. These changes are explained and justified at the beginning of the project description. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

We welcome the \$200,000 co-financing contribution to be provided by the Ministry of Environment of Tunisia. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

Yes, the financing presented is adequate and demonstrates a cost-effective approach. Some allocations among components have changed but the total project cost and co-finance remain the same. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 21, 2022:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 21, 2022:

Core Indicator 11 has not changed compared to the PIF. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 21, 2022:

Yes this has been elaborated. Please address the following minor comment: It is mentioned a few times that the third BUR of Tunisia will be submitted to the UNFCCC by December 2022. According to the UNFCCC's BUR database, this has not occurred yet. Please clarify the current situation regarding the BUR submission.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the update. Cleared.

Agency Response
Response 26 January 2023

Third BUR ([BUR3](https://unfccc.int/BURs)) was submitted to the UNFCCC on December 28, 2022 and is available here: <https://unfccc.int/BURs>
The text in the ProDoc and CEO ER is updated accordingly.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

Yes this well elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

December 21, 2022:

1. The note "all Tunisia, as all PA Parties, must submit its first BTR ... at the latest by 31 December 2024" is not correct as the least developed country (LDC) Parties and small island developing States (SIDS) may submit this information at their discretion. Please amend this note accordingly.

2. The structure of this section includes elements which should be included in other parts of the project description such as: paragraphs following "The objective of the project is fully aligned to the Programming Directions for the CBIT" (to be included under "4) Alignment with GEF Focal Area and/or Impact Program strategies"); the consideration of the situation "without the support of the CBIT project"(to be include under the incremental reasoning. As a result, this section is not clearly organized, includes repetitions and is not easy to read. Please improve the clarity of this section focusing on the expected information (the alternative scenario) and move the other information to the appropriate sections.

3. Regarding the gap related to ?Lack of sufficient national institutional arrangements? (linked to Output 2.1.1), it is mentioned that the end situation will be ?National inventory arrangements will be fully developed and recommended [?].? While we welcome this target, we expect that the end situation goes beyond development and recommendation, and aims for engagement and adoption by relevant stakeholders and institutions. Please reconsider this target accordingly.

4. Similar to the previous comment, regarding the gaps related to: a) ?Lack of a monitoring and evaluation system of adaptation? (linked to Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2); and b) ?Lack of institutional arrangements and capacities to track support needed and received? (linked to Outputs 1.1.1 and 2.3.1). We expect that the end situations goes beyond development or recommenfatation and aims for actual engagement and adoption by relevant stakeholders and institutions. Please reconsider the relevant targets accordingly.

February 15, 2023:

1, 2, 3 and 4. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

1. A clarification "Least developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing States (SIDS) have discretion to submit their first BTR later?" has been added to the CEO ER (Part II: Project justification, 1a: Project description, section 3) and in the ProDoc (part III: Strategy)

2. The alternative scenario section in the CEO ER has been restructured and clarified.

As suggested:

- paragraphs following "The objective of the project is fully aligned to the Programming Directions for the CBIT" are now included under "4) Alignment with GEF Focal Area and/or Impact Program strategies"; and

- the consideration of the situation "without the support of the CBIT project" is included under the incremental reasoning.

3. The end of project target has been revised to "adopted by the key stakeholders and institutions?" (See the gap analysis table 0 in the CEO ER and table no. 1 in the ProDoc).

4. The end of project targets have been revised as suggested and aim for adoption by relevant stakeholders and institutions (See the gap analysis in the CEO ER and table no. 1 in the ProDoc).

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

Please also use in this section the relevant information included in the alternative scenario as indicated in the previous comment.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Information has been included in the CEO ER, Part II: Project justification, 1a: Project description, section 4, in line with the previous comment.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

Please clarify how will the project coordinate with the NAP mentioned in the baseline scenario.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Clarification on the coordination with the NAP has been provided in the CEO ER under Part II: Project justification, 1a: Project description, section 5, and in the Prodoc under part IV: Results and Partnerships (Component 2, Outcome 2.2, Output 2.2.1).

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 22, 2022:

The project is at country scale. Cleared.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 22, 2022:

1. Most of the roles in "TABLE 1. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN" are very vague, especially (but not only) for CSOs and the private sector. It is indicated that the stakeholders "will be involved/would participate in several activities"... "induced by/related to the outcomes...". Please be more specific about the engagement and contribution of each stakeholders in the project.
2. Is the paragraph "The main objective of this project ...improve the transparency framework in the country" relevant in this section? Please clarify its link with stakeholders engagement or remove it.

3. The paragraph "Additionally, gender equality will be... in Annex 10 of the ProDoc: Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan." belongs to the next section of the Portal on Gender. Please amend accordingly.

4. The summary of the consultations consultation remains very vague on who actually participated in the process. We learn about "meetings with key actors involved" and "online questionnaire was developed and sent to relevant climate change stakeholders". Please clarify who exactly has been consulted and who actually participated in the elaboration of the engagement plan either through meetings or questionnaire (the list of these stakeholders should be consistent with the table 1).

February 15, 2023:

1, 2, 3 and 4. Thank you for the clarification, amendments and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

1. The stakeholder's engagement plan was built and validated with the concerned stakeholders. Outputs have been added to Table 1. Stakeholder engagement plan in the CEO ER to better reflect and further specify the engagement of these stakeholders, and to the table 7 in the ProDoc.

2. A clarification for linking the project objective with stakeholders' engagement has been provided in the CEO ER (Part II: Project justification, 2: Stakeholders) and in the ProDoc under Annex 8: Stakeholder engagement plan.

3. Paragraph related to Gender has been removed from the Stakeholders section.

4. Additional information including the list of stakeholders consulted and participated on the elaboration of the engagement plan and the validation workshop have been added to the CEO ER (Part II: Project justification, 2: Stakeholders) and to the ProDoc (Annex 8: Stakeholder engagement plan).

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

Yes, but the CEO Approval entry in the Portal is the main project document for the GEF and the only reference to the Annex 10 of the Agency Prodoc is not enough. Please include in this section a complete summary of the gender analysis.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Summary of the Gender Analysis is included in the respective section of the GEF portal. A complete Gender Analysis and Action Plan is also uploaded in the GEF portal as a separate attachment and as an annex 10 of the Agency ProDoc.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

Some information is unclear. We learn that "Private sector representatives will also be targeted by output 1.1.2", "In addition, Private actors will be targeted by the various networking activities, seminars and consultation workshops (involved under Output 1.1.3)" and "Several important sectors (e.g. Cement sector, brick industry, etc.) will also be involved in all activities under Outcome 1.1". Please clarify what all these engagements clearly mean in terms of activities in and contribution to the project.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Clarification has been provided in the CEO ER - Table 1: Stakeholders? engagement plan and under Part II: Project justification, Section 4. Private Sector Engagement, and in the Table 7 of the GEF Agency ProDoc.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 22, 2022:

We appreciate the reference to the STAP guidelines for the climate risk assessment. Considering the climate risk is considered as low and to facilitate the reading of the proposal, please ensure all the climate risk analysis is provided in the prodoc and/or uploaded as a separate document in the Portal and provide in this section a summary of the findings.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response
Response 26 January 2023

The climate risk assessment has been presented in section on risks of Chapter IV of the Prodoc. The section 5. Risk of the CEO ER presents only a summary of the findings in order to facilitate the reading.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 22, 2022:

1. UNDP is expected to undertake executing functions and this arrangement is requested by the OFP of Tunisia. Such exceptional disposition should be based on two important analysis: 1. the strong demonstration of the needs due to the lack of capacity of the identified Executing Agency (MoE) and 2. a clear assesment showing there is no other third party in capacity to undertake these functions. Both analysis are missing in the project documentation. To allow the GEF assess the relevance of the proposed arrangement, please provide this information both as a separate document uplaoded in the Portal and as a summary in the institutional arrangement section of the CEO Approval entry of the portal (including the exact functions and their cost).

2. The budget provided (as uploaded document and in the Annex E of the portal) doesn't include the information on the "Responsible Entity" for each of the expense (the last column surprisingly only mentions the number "1981" for all the expenses). Please clarify this column using the GEF template and specifying the name of the Responsible Entity.

3. The cost of one Chief technical Advisor is covered by the components. Please note that as described in the budget with general terms (drafting TORs, concept notes...), this cost should be covered by the PMC.

February 15, 2023:

1. Thank you for the justification provided. Nevertheless in this section it is written that the Implementing Partner (Executing Partner in GEF terminology) will be responsible for the following tasks: "Procurement of goods and services, including human resources" and "Financial management, including overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets". These executing tasks are among those UNDP is requesting to carry out. This is not consistent. Please clarify.

1bis. In addition, we take note of the executing functions the OFP request UNDP to handle including the recruitment of project staff and consultant. Please confirm explicitly in this section that the Executing Agency (Ministry of Environment) will take the final decision approving all the expenses made by UNDP and related to these functions.

2. Thank you for completing the budget with the information on the "Responsible Entity" for each of the expense. Cleared.

3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

February 27, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

1. The summary of the execution support needs and of the main results of the assessment conducted to identify a third party in capacity to undertake execution support functions have been added under the section "6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination" of the CEO ER. The detailed assessment and the government request for UNDP to provide execution support services have been added to project documentation and uploaded in the GEF portal.

2. The Responsible Entity in the budget (Annex E to the CEO request in the portal) has been added.

3. The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) will provide substantial technical assistance services to components 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the project. The CTA will be expected to have substantial experience on capacity building in enhancement of MRV/Transparency frameworks and

understanding of global and national climate change issues in particular related to the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement. He/She will ensure the programmatic alignment of the project's deliverables (developed during the various technical assistance missions) with the national and international reference frameworks. As indicated in the terms of reference in Annex 7 (in the Agency ProDoc), the CTA will be responsible for reviewing these deliverables for their endorsement by the national partner as well as for the technical facilitation of the consultation processes for the development of the national NDC tracking system. This support, which is estimated at 80% of the CTA's work time, will ensure the achievement of the planned results for each of the components. This does not include the project management tasks such as sourcing relevant expertise, logistics, monitoring budget and timely execution of activities, reporting, etc., which represent only 20% of his/her work time (charged on PMC); these will be carried out by the project associate under the supervision of the CTA.

Response 21 February 2023

1. Please note that the text is providing General roles and responsibilities of the Executing Partner (Implementing Partner in UNDP terminology) in the projects' governance mechanism. Under support to NIM modality, UNDP CO provides execution support services at the request of the Executing Agency and in accordance with the provisions of the letter of agreement (LoA) (Annex 12. of the ProDoc). To provide more clarity, an explanatory note is added to the CEO ER under section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

While Executing Partner may request UNDP to provide financial transaction services in line with the LoA, overall "Financial management, including overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets" remains within the responsibilities of the Executing Partner (MoE).

In this modality, UNDP is accountable for the provision of services requested by Executing Partner, including their quality and timeliness. The Executing Partner has full programmatic control, however, and so full accountability for and ownership of project activities.

1bis. UNDP will provide execution support services, including recruitment of the projects staff and consultants at the request of the Executing Partner and in accordance with the provisions agreed in the LoA. The Executing Partner (Ministry of Environment) will keep ownership, follow-up on the work and approve deliverables. UNDP will proceed with the payments upon written approval/certification of the deliverable(s) by the Executing Partner.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

The paragraphe "Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from [below:...](#)" is repeated. Please remove one of them.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Done (duplication removed from the portal).

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

The description provides useful information on the approach based on the project outputs and activities but is unclear about the main key deliverables with their respective budget and timeline. Please complete with this information too.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

The KM section in the CEO ER has been revised to include key deliverables with respective budget and timeline.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

The signatures are missing in the uploaded ESS document (page 33). Please complete the final screening with the needed signatures.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

The signed SESP attached.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

The M&E Plan doesn't look to be specific to this project (we learn surprisingly that "The GEF Core indicators will be used to monitor global environmental benefits and will be updated for reporting to the GEF" - which core indicators?). Please clarify and adapt the information provided to this project in particular.

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

The standard M&E requirements for MSP projects apply to the CBIT projects and the text has been adapted accordingly, i.e. MTR is not required for MSPs and not budgeted under this project.

The GEF core indicator #11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment is applicable for this project. The indicator will be monitored during implementation and reported accordingly.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

Partially. All the Annexes are provided but some clarification is needed in the Annexes A and E as already commented in the relevant boxes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Comments on annexes A and E were addressed in the portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

When considering the number of beneficiaries, please also explicitly refer to "GEF core indicator 11: People benefiting from GEF-financed investments".

February 15, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 26 January 2023

Indicator 1 in the Project Results Framework has been revised to read "GEF core indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment?".

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 22, 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 21, 2022:

Yes. According to the information provided in Annex C, \$11, 428.08 have been spent to date and \$38,571.92 have been committed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 22, 2022:

The project is at country scale. Cleared.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 22, 2022:

Not yet. Please address the comments made above.

February 15, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

February 27, 2023:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The CEO approval of this project is now recommended.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| First Review | 12/22/2022 | 1/26/2023 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 2/15/2023 | 2/21/2023 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 2/27/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Note: the limited executing functions to be carried out by the GEF Agency UNDP (2.5% of the project budget) have been justified by the GEF Agency, requested by the OFP, and also approved by the GEF CBIT Manager.

COVER MEMO:

Context and problems to address

Since the ratification of the UNFCCC in 1993, Tunisia has been fulfilling its commitments to the Convention, by pursuing a strong climate change policy both on GHG mitigation and adaptation, and by complying with its national reporting commitments (national

communications, biennial update reports) in addition to the elaboration of NDC. Tunisia ratified the Paris Agreement on October 17, 2016 and published its revised NDC in October 2021.

The engagement described above provides a strong baseline in terms of climate change reporting and target setting capacity. Nevertheless, this capacity still needs to be strengthened to fulfill the Convention requirements which are evolving, and especially taking into account the recent adoption of the MPG and the need to submit a BTR and a national inventory report with comprehensive and accurate data by the end of 2024. To do so, the following barriers have been identified: The lack of organizational and institutional capacities and framework in relation to GHG inventory preparation and tracking NDC implementation; the lack of NDC tracking tool; the lack of capacity and tools to measure vulnerability/adaptation; the lack of capacity and tools to track support needed and received; lack of sustainable inventory system and capacity to prepare high quality inventories; and the lack of fully functioning MRV tools.

The project objectives and components:

The objective of the CBIT project is to assist the Government of Tunisia in providing support for building institutional and technical capacities to meet the ETF requirements through strengthening the country's MRV/transparency framework for NDC tracking, establishing the essential components of the integrated national MRV and M&E systems for transparency-related actions and progress, and ensuring capacity-building and knowledge sharing. All the project outputs planned under each of the four components will have a direct contribution in improving the transparency framework over time.

To meet this objective, the project will address the identified gaps through the following 4 components: 1. Strengthening of Tunisia's enabling environment and capacities for NDC tracking; 2. Establishment of essential components to operationalize the integrated national MRV and M&E systems for transparency-related actions and progress; 3. Monitoring and evaluation of the project; and 4. Knowledge Management.

To improve the results, Tunisia's CBIT project plans to articulate with and benefit from the GEF-funded CBIT Global Coordination Platform. The project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment. 300 stakeholders are expected to benefit from this project (including 50% female).

Co-financing:

In addition to the GEF contribution of \$1,680,825, the Ministry of Environment of Tunisia will provide an additional in-kind contribution of \$200,000.

COVID-19 risks and opportunities analysis:

Tunisia has been hit by the COVID-19 pandemic officially since 2 March 2020. Since then and in application of the laws related to crisis and disaster management, the Tunisian

government has put in place a national response plan and implemented various intervention strategies according to the evolution of the pandemic (lockdown and application of barriers measures, isolation, travel restrictions and curfews, mass screening campaigns, etc.). For this project in particular, the identified risks relate to the availability of technical expertise, capacity, and changes in timelines; the actual stakeholder Engagement Process hindered by mobility restrictions; enabling environment affected by Government priorities change because of the pandemic; and price increase in procurement. For all these risks, mitigation measures are presented in the project description.

In terms of opportunities, an improved climate transparency system which can better track the progress of implementation, and thus evaluate the effectiveness of different measures, becomes a potentially powerful tool to "build back better". The CBIT project will provide a knowledge management system and tools and capacity to collect and analyze data for the implementation and tracking of mitigation and in adaptation sectors. The increased transparency and available information will allow national policy planners and decision-makers to formulate climate-informed policies and include better-informed climate considerations in national planning and in post-covid-19 recovery plans and strategies. Additionally, COVID-19 introduces the opportunity to slowly introduce e-governance (online public service provision plans and strategies). Additionally, COVID-19 introduces the opportunity to slowly introduce e-governance (online public service provision and delivery without physical interactions) over time, enabling service provisions in both rural and urban areas. In fact, given the long-term need of practicing social distancing, COVID-19 is likely to introduce policy changes to many global meetings and conferences to enable innovative and digital modalities to be fully employed, applied and rolled out to countries. This is likely to change the travel-intensive modalities of conducting Convention businesses, thus contributing to its long-term desired outcome.