

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

December 22, 2016

FIP INVESTMENT PLAN FOR TUNISIA Comments from United Kingdom

Tunisia FIP Investment Plan – Comments from United Kingdom

- **Congratulate Tunisia** on their IP and for submitting well within the 24 month period. Also like to thank the reviewer who did an excellent job in suggesting areas for improvement during the IP development process.
- There is much that is good in the plan – and we should highlight some elements:
- The plan is very **well aligned with national strategic objectives** in REDD+ and the NRM sector but also more broadly with the wider **democratization process** in-country and efforts to reduce inequality between regions, enhance citizen participation in resource management decisions that affect them, and bring about change to the ways of working of state administration at all levels. These are critical elements for **ensuring stability in a young democracy**. This IP therefore is as much a governance reform and change management plan to maintain stability, as it is a natural resources management one.
- We welcome the focus on improving land and natural resource management across community, state and private land which requires a **landscape approach** to address the intersections between agriculture, pastoral and forest-based livelihoods.
- We also welcome an IP that takes on a significant challenge in **restoring degraded land to productivity** as a way of building resilience (of ecosystems and livelihoods), addressing geographical marginalization and contributing to climate change mitigation.
- It is particularly refreshing to see a focus on **learning from past experience of interventions that went less well**.

However – there are a number of areas where the plan could be improved further. These include:

- Apart from a short section on addressing disparities and some analysis in Annex 15, the IP would benefit from a **stronger gender and social inclusion analysis**, particularly highlighting what sort of interventions under the projects could address the issues identified. In particular, the **challenges associated with high levels of unemployment**, most likely amongst younger men, should be explored. There are likely to be significant social and cultural dimensions associated with **challenged masculine identities** which the programme could be more explicit about, and it could highlight how project interventions will

help to address some of these issues through increasing targeted employment opportunities. Young unemployed men with limited opportunities are potentially vulnerable to radicalization and as such, tackling the disparity of opportunity in the target regions is very important. A thorough gender and social inclusion analysis is needed to do this. The CIF AU Senior social development and gender specialist – Anne Kuriakose could provide some guidance.

- The reviewer identified **wood energy for heating** in particular as a key driver of degradation. Whilst some analysis has been attempted this could be strengthened and the opportunities to include wood energy value chains within projects should be explored, including more efficient wood burning heating systems and their associated value chains.
- The reviewer also highlighted the important role of government in funding NRM activities in the past, and that it allocated significant resources to restoration. **The IP does not include any Government co-financing in the budget tables.**
- There is a wealth of information in the annexes, some of which should be highlighted/referenced better in the main text
- The **cultural shift** required to move from more top down approaches to participatory ones will require time and there may be some resistance. This should be factored into risks since it goes beyond political will to how government departments respond to wholesale change.
- The project proposals are still at concept stage but providing a little more detail including on how they interact with each other, will help the proposal and each project separately should the concepts be targeted at separate funds. Developing a theory of change for each project and demonstrating how these align with the overarching programme theory of change will be helpful. Some specific comments:
 - More information on the proposed **incentive schemes** for private land holders is needed, along with clarity on how the fund will be capitalised. It was not clear how support to private owners in restoration efforts was to be financed – loans? Subsidies? Grants?
 - It was not clear whether projects one and two overlap in the same geographical area. If they do, the work with private owners will need to be integrated within the landscape territorial planning process proposed under project one.
 - The focus on value chains is good, but it raises questions about how the natural resource base upon which the value chains depend is going to be managed sustainably. Multiple-use land and forest management

will be required in order to supply value chains sustainably. Licensing extraction on a product by product basis could promote competition and resource degradation. **A holistic approach to forest/rangeland management for the supply of multiple products will be needed. Not all products will be compatible from the same unit area of land. Trade-offs will need to be managed** – which can be done via the landscape approach

- The focus on rangelands in project three is welcome but as the reviewer correctly states, degradation is also a function of **herd management and quality**. It is important that the project sets out how it will address issues of livestock quality and herd size, perhaps linking to other initiatives in the livestock sector.
- We note that the GCF is considered an important source of funding – can you tell us **what discussions have already taken place** to take this forward? Will you be presenting projects individually or can you present the whole programme, demonstrating that the whole is greater than just the sum of the parts? To what extent is this investment considered a priority for requesting resources from the GCF?