

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

Review PIF 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

6/9/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

Partially. The proposal generally meets CCM8-3 of GEF 7 Programming Directions. Nevertheless, the objective of assisting in the improvement of transparency over time isn't clearly presented. Please explain how the project will improve transparency over time.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

The project is appropriately structured, and establishes a coherent and sustainable transparency framework, improving capacities of Tunisia to meet requirements of Article 13 under the Paris Agreement over time. All project outputs are connected, and their successful implementation will contribute to improved transparency and reporting of information on GHG emissions, climate actions and support.

Furthermore, successful deployment of the NDC tracking system (Outcome 1.2), an improvement of the National GHG inventory (Outcome 2.1), a strong M&E of Adaptation (2.2) and a successful MRV of support (Output 2.3), will allow the country to improve the capacities for measuring and reporting, and along with other existing systems (sectoral and sub-sectoral MRV mitigation systems based on electronic tools:

ENERINFO, NAMA TSP, electricity, building, cement sector, MRV actions) and non-electronic tools: NAMA TSP, electricity, MRV tool Tunisie for transport) will lay the foundation for the elaboration of Tunisia's first BTR and all future reports to the UNFCCC (NCs, BTRs) based on up-to-date and reliable scientific data, and informed decision-making. With a more robust and inclusive MRV system (GHG inventory, NDC tracking system) and M&E system for adaptation in place, Tunisia can coordinate for a more realistic and improved NDC implementation and will have the necessary information to strengthen ambition in the future and identify new priority areas for action, along with the resources needed to ensure that each NDC cycle builds on the previous one. Reaching such results would not be possible if the institutional structure for each of the CBIT project components is not well and sustainably established. Stronger and better coordinated national institutions and tools will permit Tunisia to achieve the provisions of Article 13 of the Paris Agreement and improve transparency in the country.

Please note that changes have been made in the following sections of the PIF :

- ? 1a.Project Description - 1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed
- ? 1a.Project Description - 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

1. The Output 1.1.2. states "Organizational capacities are strengthened to operationalize the NDC governance system?". Please clarify so that the outcomes/outputs align with building transparency specifically and not broader NDC governance.
2. The Output 2.3.4 seeks to strengthen actors' capacity in the field of access to climate finance. This is indeed a very important topic but it doesn't appear aligned with the objective of enhancing the country's transparency framework. Please explain, reformulate or consider removing this output.
3. One of the outcomes is missing in component 3 as compared to the description of the alternative scenario. Please complete accordingly.

4. The table B has repeated text as shown below as example. Please remove the non necessary repetitions in the table B (as much as the system allows).

Project Objective						
Enhance Governance and Transparency of NDC implementation in Tunisia						
Project Component	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
1. Strengthening of Tunisia's NDC Governance System	Technical Assistance	1.1. Enhanced institutional and organizational capacities to monitor and communicate the progress towards the NDC goals	1.1.1. An institutional governance / accountability framework for the NDC is designed and established 1.1.2. Organizational capacities are strengthened to operationalize the NDC governance system	GET	105,000	
1. Strengthening of Tunisia's NDC Governance System	Technical Assistance	1.1. Enhanced institutional and organizational capacities to monitor and communicate the progress towards the NDC goals	1.1.3. A framework of public communication, exchange protocol (knowledge sharing: seminars, workshops, monthly letters ...) and transparency on the results in the realization of the objectives of the NDC is established	GET	130,000	
1. Strengthening of Tunisia's NDC Governance System	Technical Assistance	1.2. Successful deployment and demonstration of the Monitoring System of Progress in Achieving NDC's objectives	1.2.1. A tracking system for NDC results' reporting (tracking indicators, scheme and operation system, etc.) is designed.	GET	100,000	

March 22, 2022:

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

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

1. Component 1 has been adjusted as follow: "Strengthening of Tunisia's MRV/transparency framework for NDC tracking", while:

Output 1.1.1 has been modified as "An institutional framework for NDC tracking is designed and established as part of the national MRV and M&E systems for transparency-related actions and progress"

Output 1.1.2 has been modified as "Organizational capacities are strengthened to operationalize the NDC tracking system for enhanced transparency"

2. Please see changes at section "1a. Project Description / 3) The proposed alternative scenario / Output 2.3.4". Output 2.3.4 has been deleted and the corresponding section of the PIF of output 2.3.3 has been revised accordingly.

3. The GEF portal revised to include missing information on outcome 3.1.

4. The GEF portal revised. Repeated text removed.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

Co-financing of \$50,000 in-kind from the government is being mobilized. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022

In-kind co-financing from the government has been increased to \$200,000.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

Yes. The project is requesting funding from the CBIT set-aside. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 19, 2020:

The project is requesting a total of \$1,658,925 from the CBIT set-aside (including project cost, fees and PPG). Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022

Requested PPG amount is raised to \$50,000 and in total the project is requesting \$1,680,825 (including project cost, fees and PPG)

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
June 19, 2020:

Yes, the PPG is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

Agency Response
Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
June 19, 2020:

Yes, the project will benefit to 300 stakeholders, including 150 male and 150 female.
Cleared.

Agency Response
Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
June 19, 2020:

Yes, the project is properly tagged. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
June 22, 2020:

The section mostly lays out the transparency obligations under the UNFCCC and, in a succinct way in the last two paragraphs, the problems that Tunisia faces in relation to implementing these obligations. But it does not adequately describe, as expected, the root causes and barriers that have limited the implementation of the transparency framework.

For example, regarding the lack of organizational and technical infrastructure for NDC implementation and monitoring; and reporting at a project level: what are the barriers to address these problems and how the project will address these issues? Another example: the baseline scenario describes how Tunisia has developed the concept of a National Inventory System (SNIEGES) and MRV Systems. However, it is unclear what the barriers/root causes are for implementation/operationalization of these.

In this section, please elaborate further the problems and fully describe the root causes and barriers to justify the need for the activities proposed in the project.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022

Additional clarification has been provided on root causes and barriers under the section "1a. Project Description - 1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?".

It should be noted that as much as the MPGs are extensive and very detailed in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, Tunisia, along with many other countries, currently lacks capacity to follow and apply them in their entirety. Capacity-building and support will be crucial to facilitate improvement in reporting over time for these countries.

Concretely, a transparency framework that fits Article 13 requirements would necessitate further efforts to sustain the currently engaged transparency actions in Tunisia. The country needs support to develop its long-term transparency capacities, on two main priorities: (i) Establishing a strong set-up of NDC tracking including an institutional framework that is fully able to appropriately coordinate actions, monitor NDC achievements and update its objectives, (ii) Strengthening of the integrated national MRV system by establishing a tracking system for progress made in NDC implementation and achievement, consolidating capacities of the GHG inventory team, and building a Vulnerability/Adaptation M&E system as well as a reliable MRV system targeting support (financial, capacity development and technology transfer).

Tunisia faces the following barriers in relation to meeting these transparency challenges:

- v Lack of organizational and institutional capacities and framework in relation to GHG inventory preparation and tracking NDC implementation*
- v Lack of NDC tracking tool*
- v Lack of capacity and tools to measure vulnerability/adaptation*
- v Lack of capacity and tools to track support needed and received*

- v Lack of sustainable inventory system and capacity to prepare high quality inventories
- v Lack of fully functioning MRV tools

Furthermore, by having a better tracking system, Tunisia will also be able to timely and better coordinate the preparation of submissions to the UNFCCC (BURs/BTRs, NCs, NDCs, etc.), all of which are key pillars for transparency and will lead to more efficient implementation of the NDC.

In this context, the implementation of this project will assist Tunisia in meeting the challenges resulting from the full implementation of the Paris Agreement and the enhanced transparency framework.

Please also notice that the section mostly lays out the transparency obligations under the UNFCCC because this was important as an advocacy section targeting Tunisians who were supposed to review the submission.

Some barriers, resulting implications and how the project will deal with these are also explained under the section *1a. Project Description - 2/ The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects?*.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

Yes, the baseline scenario has been adequately described. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

1. Tunisia has undergone the Technical Analysis of its BUR, and most recently participated in the FSV process as well. We note that some of the project components draw on the recommendations/discussions from these. We recommend streamlining and focusing on some of the transparency-specific recommendations.

2. Output 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3: It is not clear how/which activities would relate specifically to transparency and tracking NDC progress (as opposed to NDC governance) and as a result to the CBIT project. Please clarify and ensure the outputs and activities focus on transparency.

3. Output 1.2.2: It is unclear how the project will ensure the participation of the relevant stakeholders in this process. Please consider an in-between activity wherein while the monitoring system is being developed consultations with other ministries are held to get early buy-in on such a tracking system.

4. The output 2.2.3 will be implemented once the outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are completed. To ensure a successful application of Gender-specific impact indicators (rather than a testing), we wonder whether it wouldn't be more efficient to consider this output conjunction with the outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 so that the information system is developed simultaneously. Please explain the rationale of this choice or adjust the proposed activities accordingly.

5. Outcome 2.3: Please explain what are the "three categories of supports" the outcome is referring to.

6. As mentioned above, the output 2.3.4 on access to climate finance doesn't appear aligned with the objective of enhancing the country's transparency framework. Please consider reformulate or cancel this activity.

7. The Component 3 is unclear. It has 2 outcomes "3.1" in the description and only one in table B. In addition, it contains activities that are normally part of the PMC (final evaluation). In addition, beyond stating that the "M&E component should ascertain whether and how the project has helped" in certain activities, the concrete activities in this component remain very general. Please clarify this component and elaborate further and specify the activities.

March 22, 2022:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Thank you for the clarification, adjustments and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

1. A table has been added in the PIF, at the beginning of the section *?1a. Project Description - 3) The proposed alternative scenario?*, clarifying further the linkages between identification of Capacity-Building needs as reported by the summary report of the technical analysis and by BURs and National Communication, on one side, and outcomes/outputs in this proposal, on the other side.
2. Those outputs will focus on enhancing institutional and organizational capacities of the transparency framework and not on supporting NDC implementation. Additional language has been added in the description of the three outputs. The outputs are revised as listed below:

1.1.1. An institutional framework for NDC tracking is designed and established as part of the national MRV and M&E systems for transparency-related actions and progress

1.1.2. Organizational capacities are strengthened to operationalize the NDC tracking system for enhanced transparency

1.1.3. A framework of public communication, exchange and transparency on progress towards the NDC implementation and achievement is established as part of the national MRV and M&E systems for transparency-related actions and progress

3. A paragraph has been added in the output 1.2.2 (section *1a. Project Description 3) The proposed alternative scenario?*). Indeed, in parallel with the development of the tracking system, actions to build capacities of the stakeholders to be involved, specifically on the use of that system will be undertaken. These stakeholders will be early consulted since the design of the tracking system and while the system is being developed to ensure the buy-in. As such, the project will ensure the participation of the relevant stakeholders in the operationalization of the NDC tracking system.
4. We appreciate GEF Sec's suggestion with which we agree. Output 2.2.3 will be implemented in parallel to 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 and language has been modified in the PIF as such (section *1a. Project Description 3) The proposed alternative scenario?- Output 2.2.3*).
5. Three categories of support are listed the PIF document. It includes *Financing, capacity building and technology development & transfer.* (section *1a. Project Description 3) The proposed alternative scenario?- Outcome 2.3*).
6. Output 2.3.4 has been deleted.
7. The Component 3 is reserved to the Monitoring and Evaluation of the project and has one *Outcome 3.1: Achievement of the project objectives and activities monitored and evaluated?* and one *Output 3.1.1: Project financial and progress reports prepared and submitted according to M&E plan?*. These activities listed under the component 3 are in line with [the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy](#), detailed on page 18. As referenced in the related GEF Policy, the independent Terminal Evaluation is part of the M&E activities and its cost charged under the M&E component of the project.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

The description is very succinct. Please explain how the project align with the CBIT strategy, including as regard to the improvement of transparency over time of this project as mentioned above.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

Text on the alignment with CBIT strategy and enhancement of the transparency has been revised under part ?1a. Project Description - 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?.

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

1. The incremental cost reasoning remains vague and need to be clarified. It is an important element justifying the project approach and activities. Please elaborate further how the proposed activities will solve the identified problems and their root causes, taking into account the barriers and building on the baseline scenario.

In particular, please consider the following comments:

2. Output 1.2.1: The baseline scenario presents already important works already implemented which relates to this output. Please clarify how this will build on and add value to already existing work that has been done related to MRV systems (especially on MRV of mitigation measures) and the sectors this would include.

3. Output 2.1.3: An inventory information system was already put in place and training was also given on this information system in 2018, which is not so long time ago. The justification of this activities and how they build on what has already been done are therefore unclear. Please clarify accordingly and, in particular, how this output will take into consideration the barriers/capacity gaps that might have been previously faced in 2018 that will help in developing a sustainable system.

4. Output 2.2.2 and Output 2.2.4: Please clarify how these outputs will take into consideration lessons learned from the current MRV system while building the one on MRV of Adaptation/Vulnerability.

March 22, 2022:

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

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

1. The section *1a. Project Description ? 5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing?* has been revised, in particular:
2. Output 1.2.1 will build on already existing work that has been done related to MRV systems and complete it. The NDC tracking system will include the tracking of progress made in implementing mitigation policies and measures, measure by measure in all the sectors concerned (including actions in the waste, forestry and agriculture sectors) and will interact with already existing sectoral and sub-sectoral MRV systems (ENERINFO, NAMA TSP, electricity, building, cement sector,) for the tracking of mitigation policies and measures in these sectors/subsectors.
3. Output 2.1.3: Even if training was recently given on this information system, the system is not fed by information from sectoral inventory teams and was not yet utilized since the last national GHG inventory (year 2012). To ensure an efficient compilation and data transmission to the inventory system, output 2.1.3 aims at updating the training program to align with the new reporting guidelines (CRT) and enlarging the trained teams to new skilled people in order to strengthen the capacity of the inventory groups, in particular with respect to feeding the GHG information system. The activities implied by this output will lay the foundations for the establishment of the national inventory system, at least in its part dedicated to the compilation and the transmission of the data.
4. Output 2.2.2 and Output 2.2.4: One of the main activities to be undertaken as part of the design of the M&E system of Adaptation/Vulnerability will be the analysis of previous and current experience with MRV systems to take them into consideration for further enhancement and build on lessons learned.
6. **Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

The project will benefit to 300 stakeholders which will indirectly benefit to climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

1. The output 1.2.3 refers to an "application of the system ... carried out for the years 2016 to 2022". In addition, in the sustainability section, the description states that "such

system will be implemented for the years 2016 to 2022". It is unclear how the project will have an action in the past (from 2016) and these activities will be maintained 2022. Please clarify accordingly.

2. The potential for scaling-up is focused at regional and global level but the description doesn't mention how the implemented activities will allow the necessary scale-up so that the transparency framework can cover all the relevant sectors and geographies in the country. Please elaborate further accordingly.

March 22, 2022:

1 and 2. thank you for the clarification and the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

Please see additional paragraphs in section 7 (Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up)

1. The section *1a. Project Description* 3) *The proposed alternative scenario - Output 1.2.3?* has been revised. The NDC tracking system will be utilized to as a concrete application to track progress in implementation of the updated NDC by integrating and compiling all the data relating to the elapsed years in the updated NDC implementation period. As specified in Tunisia official NDC update report, this implementation period covers 2021-2030. Concrete application of the tracking system during the GEF project will cover data of the first year of NDC implementation, namely 2021, and most recent data of subsequent years if available. Beyond the GEF project duration, the system will be regularly utilized for tracking progress made in implementation of the updated NDC.

2. The implemented activities under the GEF project will allow the necessary scale-up so that the transparency framework can cover all the relevant sectors and geographies in the country by establishing institutional arrangements, building national capacity and developing a system for NDC tracking that will allow the implementation of a sustainable monitoring of the NDC implementation. As a first application, such system will be implemented for the elapsed years in the updated NDC implementation period. The design of the NDC tracking system will cover all the relevant sectors and geographies included in the updated NDC. As a reminder, it is worth mentioning that Tunisia updated NDC covers the entire national territory. It reflects all the anthropogenic emissions and removals reported in the inventory chapter of the 2nd Biennial Report and of the third national communication of Tunisia. It includes therefore:

? All sectors, as defined by the 2006 IPCC guidelines: Energy, Industrial Processes and Product Use, Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use, and Waste (solid and sanitation).

? Within each sector, all subcategories and emission sources, in accordance with the 2006 IPCC guidelines

- ? All sources of carbon absorption covered by the sector (soils and biomass, by land use activity) as per the 2006 IPCC 2006 IPCC guidelines
- ? All greenhouse gases covered by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, especially those with GWPs (CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, SF6).

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

The project is at country scale. Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

The description says that "All stakeholders involved in Climate Change... have been discussing institutional and technical needs with regards to transparency activities". But we don't know how concretely this happened. In addition, it is unclear which are the stakeholders that were consulted for the project identification phase and how their recommendations were taken into consideration. Please elaborate further on how the stakeholders have been consulted, including the IPLC and CSOs that are ticked as having participated in consultations during the project identification phase.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, the "NDC implementation Roadmap" including the list of Participants is not accessible. Please upload this document in the Portal.

March 31, 2022:

Thank you for uploading the NDC implementation roadmap including the list of the consulted stakeholders. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 31, 2022: The NDC implementation Roadmap including the list of Participants is attached in the Portal as a separate attachment.

March 3, 2022:

Text under section ?2. *Stakeholders?* has been revised.

Kindly note that Tunisia does not have indigenous peoples. All other stakeholders including CSOs have been involved in the discussions during the preparation of the NDC Roadmap including discussion on institutional and technical needs with regards to transparency activities. Their recommendations have been taken into consideration in the design of this GEF project activities. The consultation process has included the organization of two consultation workshops that took place in July 2017 and March 2018 respectively, and several high-level meetings with all involved sectors which took place during the process of preparing the NDC roadmap.[1]¹ Overall, more than 120 people participated in that consultation processes. [2]² Consultations included sectoral ministries, governmental entities, research & academia and more than 12 NGOs from different thematic areas and regions (Youth Alternative Network, Regional NGOs, NGOs specialized on small loans, NGOs specialized on water, NGOs specialized on agricultural development, etc.).

[1] See ? NDC implementation Roadmap?. September 2019. Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment-Tunisia/UNDP.

[2] The list of participants to the consultation process is included in the Annex of the document: ? NDC implementation Roadmap?. September 2019. Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment-Tunisia/UNDP.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

The description is very succinct and generic. Please elaborate on which private sector stakeholders will be targeted, how they are expected to participate and contribute to the transparency framework of Tunisia.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

Section 4. Private Sector Engagement? has been revised.

Private sector will be involved in various activities of the project as many of the Tunisian commitments towards Paris Agreement are being reflected into the private sector activities. Private sector will be represented in the institutional framework for NDC tracking (Output 1.1.1) through the institutions that represent it such as UTICA^[1] (Tunisian Union for Industry, Trade and Handicrafts) and / or its sectoral trade union federations, the CONECT (Confederation of Tunisian Enterprises), the Tunisian Union for Agriculture and Fisheries (UTAP), or the National Chamber of Women Entrepreneurs (CNFCE), etc. 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). Several important sectors (e.g., Cement sector, brick industry, etc.) will also be involved in all activities under Outcome 1.1 through their union chambers. Cement sector is already utilizing a sector specific MRV system based on an online application. These will be part of the transparency system. Cement sector, in particular, will be targeted by outcome 2.1, given its significant contribution both to the national emissions, and mitigation efforts. Private sector industries will also be involved in the national inventory system (outcome 2.1), as they will be directly requested to feed data to the system, more particularly on the industrial processes component of the inventory. They will also be involved in activities envisioned under Output 2.3.3 that aims at strengthening, among other target groups, capacities of private actors in acceding with climate finance.

[1] UTICA represents nearly 150,000 private companies in Tunisia from all sectors, with the exceptions of tourism, banking, and financial sectors. Most of these companies consists of small and medium enterprises.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

The climate risk needs also to be taken into consideration. Please complete accordingly.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Since the time of the last review, we have requested the project developers to conduct a COVID-19 risks and opportunity analysis. Please add such analysis (including 1- risks for project design and implementation and 2- opportunities the project could offer to increase resilience against further pandemic). The COVID-19 analysis could be a separate note below the risk table. The Agency may want to refer to the GEF guidance "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" published by GEF Secretariat (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>).

March 31, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information on COVID-19. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 31, 2022:

COVID-19 risks and opportunity analysis provided. The analysis does include as required 1- risks for project design and implementation and 2- opportunities the project could offer to increase resilience against further pandemic.

Please see added text under section ?5. Risks? of the PIF document.

March 3, 2022:

Please see added climate risk in table 2 section ?5. Risks? of the PIF document.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 23, 2020:

This information isn't provided in the proposal. According to the GEF policy (GEF/C.57/Inf.05 from Dec 12, 2019), the agency should provide at PIF level:

- a. Overall preliminary risk rating for project or program
- b. Types of risks and, if available, risk ratings of identified type(s)
- c. Any early screening/assessment report(s) and / or any indicative plans/measures to address identified risks, if available.

Please complete accordingly.

March 22, 2022:

Thank you for the information provided. Nevertheless, the overall preliminary risk rating should at least be assessed and indicated in this section in the table under "Overall Project/Program Risk Classification". Please complete accordingly. In addition, please clarify why "All project activities fall under pre-SESP exemption criteria". Is it related to UNDP ESS risk screening methodology?

March 31, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 31, 2022: In line with the **UNDP Social and Environmental Standards**, *A limited range of project types are exempt from screening as listed in the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), namely projects that consist solely of any of the following functions or activities: (a) UNDP serves as Administrative Agent; (b) Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials; (c) Organization of an event, workshop, training; (d) Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences; (e) Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks; (f) Global/regional projects with no country level activities (e.g. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes); (g) Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects. These projects are assumed to be **Low Risk**.*

To design the PIF, UNDP CO has conducted a two steps preliminary assessment:

? The first assessment was conducted based on the UNDP integrated risk management approach. This preliminary assessment took into consideration the project's national and international context to identify key trends, issues, hazards and opportunities that could hamper or improve the design and implementation of the project. The result of this pre-assessment has rated the project as a low-risk project.

? The second assessment was carried out based on the UNDP's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure. The pre-screening conducted for the Tunisian CBIT project reveals that there are no potential social and environmental risks identified in the project. The CBIT project activities fall under above-mentioned exemption criteria as broadly shown here:

? Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication material (*National Communication, Biennial Update and Biennial Transparency Reports and National Determined Contributions: component 1 and 2 of the project*)

? Organization of an event, workshop, training (*creating capacities for climate reporting: all project components*)

? Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences (*supporting and enforcing a technical baseline for UNFCCC negotiations: component 1 and 2 of the project*)

? Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks (*specially a coordination with other GEF projects and activities in the country on climate mitigation and adaptation: all project components*)

Based on the assessment undertaken at PIF stage, the CBIT project is assumed to be Low Risk project. For Low Risk projects that include activities with minimal or no adverse social or environmental risks and impacts, further assessment of potential adverse social and environmental risks and impacts is not required. However, the SES Programming Principles and stakeholder engagement requirements still apply to project activities.

The applicability of the exemption criteria and risk category will be revised during project design/PPG phase, in line with UNDP Social and Environmental Standards guidelines and GEF requirements.

March 3, 2022:

Required information are added in PIF document and GEF Portal accordingly- section ?9. *Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)?*.

Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) is an initiative that supports developing countries to build institutional and technical capacity to meet the new requirements of the enhances transparency framework defined in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement.

The CBIT has three broad aims:

- Strengthen national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities;

•Provide relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement;

•Assist in the improvement of transparency over time.

The main focus of this CBIT project is to assist the Government of Tunisia in providing support for building institutional and technical capacities to meet these enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. It will use a capacity strengthening approach to shift from ad hoc reporting to a continuous process of monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) that will capture transparency activities and allow the country to track its progress against its commitments under its National Determined Contribution (NDC). The project has indeed three components:

1. Strengthening of Tunisia's NDC transparency framework and Governance System
2. Establishment of three essential components of the integrated national MRV and M&E systems
3. Monitoring and evaluation of the project

All project activities fall under pre-SESP exemption criteria as broadly shown here:

- ? Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication material (National Communication, Biennial Update Reports and National Determined Contributions: component 1 and 2 of the project)
- ? Organization of an event, workshop, training (creating capacities for climate reporting: all project components)
- ? Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences (supporting and enforcing a technical baseline for UNFCCC negotiations: component 1 and 2 of the project)
- ? Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks (specially a coordination with other GEF projects and activities in the country on climate mitigation and adaptation: all project components)

The applicability of the exemption will be revised during project development phase.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 22, 2020:

Yes, GEF OFP Mrs. Sabria Bnoui has endorsed this project. Cleared.

Agency Response

March 3, 2022:

Letter of endorsement is updated and attached separately to the project documents.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 23, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the comments above.

March 22, 2022:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

March 31, 2022:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The PIF and PPG are now recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	6/23/2020	3/16/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/22/2022	3/31/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/1/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval