



# **NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan**

**UNDP/GEF Project**  
(GEF ID No: 5182)

**Inception Report for Terminal Evaluation**

**September 2021**

## List of Abbreviations

ANME	Agence Nationale pour la Maitrise de l'Energie
ATME	Association Tunisienne pour la Maîtrise de l'Energie
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
CSP	Concentrated Solar Power
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DREI	De-risking Renewable Energy Investment
ET	Evaluation Team
ETF	Energy Transition Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HQ	Headquarters
kW	Kilowatt
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEMR	Ministry of Energy, Mines and Renewables
MELPSD	Ministry of Equipment, Land Planning and Sustainable Development
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MW	Megawatt
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ONP	Operational Focal Point
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIMS	Project Information Management System
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PV	Photovoltaic
RBM	Results-Based Management
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound

SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
STEG	Société Tunisienne de l'Electricité et du Gaz
ToR	Terms of Reference
TSP	Tunisian Solar Plan
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UTICA	Union Tunisienne de l'Industrie du Commerce et de l'Artisanat

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Background of the evaluation.....	1
Evaluation objective, purpose and scope .....	1
Project description.....	2
Project context.....	2
Brief description of the project.....	3
Barriers at the project inception .....	5
Project theory of change.....	6
Stakeholder analysis at the project inception .....	6
Cross-cutting issues.....	7
Management arrangements.....	7
Sustainability and replicability.....	8
Evaluation scope and methodology.....	8
Evaluation criteria .....	8
Evaluation methodology.....	13
Evaluation timeframe .....	15
Evaluation report format .....	15
Evaluation team composition .....	16
Evaluation ethics .....	16
Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	A-1
Annex 2: Project Results Framework.....	A-10
Annex 3: Stakeholder Engagement Plan (at project inception) .....	A-12
Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix .....	A-14
Annex 5: Performance Rating of GEF Projects .....	A-19
Annex 6: Evaluation Report Outline.....	A-21
Annex 7: List of Documents Consulted .....	A-24
Annex 8: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form .....	A-25

## Glossary of Evaluation-related Terms

Term	Definition
Baseline data	Data that describe the situation to be addressed by an intervention and serve as the starting point for measuring the performance of the intervention
Beneficiaries	The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit an intervention is undertaken
Capacity development	The process by which individuals, organizations, institutions and societies develop their abilities individually and collectively to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives
Conclusion	A reasoned judgement based on a synthesis of empirical findings or factual statements corresponding to a specific circumstance
Effect	Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results
Finding	A factual statement about the programme or project based on empirical evidence gathered through monitoring and evaluation activities
Impact	Positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention
Indicator	Quantitative or qualitative factors that provide a means to measure the changes caused by an intervention
Lessons learned	Generalizations based on evaluation experiences that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations
Logframe (logical framework approach)	Management tool used to facilitate the planning, implementation and evaluation of an intervention. It involves identifying strategic elements (activities, outputs, outcome, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and assumptions that may affect success or failure. Based on RBM (results-based management) principles
Outcome	The likely or achieved (short-term and/or medium-term) effects of an intervention's outputs
Output	The product, capital goods and/or service which results from an intervention; may also include a change resulting from the intervention which is relevant to the achievement of an outcome
Rating	an instrument for forming and validating a judgement on the relevance, performance and success of a programme or project through the use of a scale with numeric, alphabetic and/or descriptive codes
Recommendation	A proposal for action to be taken in a specific circumstance, including the parties responsible for that action
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies
Risk	Factor, normally outside the scope of an intervention, which may affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from an intervention, after the development assistance has been completed
Stakeholders	The specific individuals or organizations that have a role and interest in the objectives and implementation of a programme or project
Theory of Change	A set of assumptions, risks and external factors that describes how and why an intervention is intended to work.

## Introduction

### Background of the evaluation

The NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan (hereafter TSP NAMA) is a UNDP-supported and GEF-financed project that officially commenced on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015 with a revised planned closing date of July 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021, following the conferral of two no-cost extensions in acknowledgement of the effects of national institutional reorganization and the impacts induced by the global COVID-19 health crisis.

In line with the GEF Evaluation Policy, a Terminal Evaluation (TE) is undertaken at completion of GEF-funded projects to assess their performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability and contribution to capacity development as well as the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. As a standard requirement for all projects financed by GEF, the TE of the TSP NAMA has been initiated by the Implementing Agency, in this case the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Tunisia. As outlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the project, the terminal evaluation is being conducted by an independent consultant. This document presents the Inception Report for the TE of the UNDP/GEF project entitled “NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan” that outlines the Consultant’s understanding of the objectives of TE, the essential details of the project and the methodology that will be employed for the evaluation.

### Evaluation objective, purpose and scope

As outlined in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and related documents, each GEF project is subject to Terminal Evaluation. Evaluations that are conducted at the end of project implementation are expected to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its design, implementation, and achievement of objectives. They are also expected to promote accountability and transparency, facilitate synthesis of lessons learned, and provide feedback to allow the GEF to identify issues that are recurrent across the GEF portfolio.

The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by GEF and UNDP as stipulated in the GEF Guidance for Terminal Evaluations<sup>1</sup> and UNDP Evaluation Guidelines<sup>2</sup> as well as in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects<sup>3</sup>.

The purpose of this TE is to provide the project partners, primarily the GEF, the UNDP and the Government of Tunisia with an independent assessment of the key achievements of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects, GEF, 2017 ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf))

<sup>2</sup> UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP, 2019 (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>)

<sup>3</sup> Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, UNDP, 2020 ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf))

project as compared to the objectives of the Project Document over the complete implementation period of the project. The TE will :

- Assess the achievement of the planned outcomes and their sustainability through measurements of the changes in the set project indicators,
- Assess the effectiveness, efficiency and alignment of the project in contributing to relevant national sustainable development plans;
- Assess the handling of risks and barriers to implementation, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic;
- Summarize the experiences gained and identify lessons learned;
- Propose recommendations for the future.

The TE will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The time focus of the evaluation is the implementation period of the project from its initiation on January 5<sup>th</sup> 2015 throughout to its operational closing date on 6 October 2021. The geographic focus of the evaluation is Tunisia.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the TE is provided as Annex 1.

## Project description

### Project context

Mitigation, together with adaptation to climate change, contributes to the objective expressed in Article 2 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to stabilise “greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level to prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system”.

The concept of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) was introduced in the Bali Action Plan in 2007 (Decision 1/CP.13). The parties to the UNFCCC called for “Enhanced national/international action on mitigation of climate change” including “Nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, financing and capacity-building, in a measurable, reportable and verifiable manner” (paragraph 1(b) (ii)). This concept was further developed in subsequent meetings, namely Decision 2 CP/15 on the Copenhagen Accord, the Cancun Agreements (CoP 16) and Decision 2/CP.17.

Further to the above decisions, a NAMA can be considered to be a mitigation action tailored to the national context and capabilities (according to the ‘common but differentiated’ approach), which is in accordance with national sustainable development priorities. NAMAs are typically implemented to incentivise mitigation on a long-term basis at a sector-policy level to reduce GHG emissions permanently.

The Government of Tunisia communicated its list of NAMAs to the UNFCCC Secretariat on 17 May 2010 while qualifying that their implementation would require international support (i.e. supported NAMAs) for technology transfer and capacity building. The NAMAs submitted

by Tunisia to the UNFCCC Secretariat include the technologies contained in the Tunisian Solar Plan<sup>4</sup>.

The Tunisian Solar Plan (TSP), originally formulated in 2009, was revised in 2012 with the financial support of the Agence Française de Développement (AfD) to achieve a total renewable energy penetration target of 30% of the electricity generation mix by 2030. The technologies considered are wind, solar photovoltaic (PV) and concentrated solar power (CSP), with electricity generation contributions from each of 15%, 10% and 5% respectively<sup>5</sup>. The TSP targets are based on an electricity demand baseline that includes the voluntary adoption of energy efficiency measures over the period 2013-2020 that result in an average reduction in the demand for electricity of 1.4% per year compared to a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario of no energy efficiency measures.

### **Brief description of the project**

The “NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan” Project (TSP NAMA) was developed with the objective of supporting the Government of Tunisia in the development and implementation of a NAMA in the energy sector, in order to contribute to the achievement of the energy mitigation targets established voluntarily by the Government of Tunisia that aim to achieve a contribution of 30% renewable electricity produced from wind energy, PV and CSP by 2030.

The project is designed to support both the design and implementation of the NAMA in the energy sector, applying relevant NAMA methodologies and guidance for identifying and designing technology-specific NAMA action plans, and piloting the implementation of the NAMA activities around two baseline projects – a 10 MW public sector PV plant and a 24 MW private sector wind farm.

The Project Document structures the achievement of project objectives into three components, as described below.

**Component 1:** The enabling framework and methodologies are established to support the design and implementation of the Tunisian Solar Plan (TSP) NAMA.

**Expected outcome:** The enabling conditions, methodologies and tools are developed for de-risking the national policy environment for implementing the Tunisian Solar Plan through a NAMA.

This technical assistance component addresses the institutional and policy frameworks required to implement the TSP. It seeks to establish high-level political support and coordination mechanisms invaluable for advocating for, and coordinating, mitigation actions across several sectors.

The following outputs must be delivered to achieve the outcomes of Component 1:

Output 1.1: Establishment of a high-level Inter-Ministerial TSP NAMA Committee

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop\\_15/copenhagen\\_accord/application/pdf/tunisiacphaccord\\_app2.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop_15/copenhagen_accord/application/pdf/tunisiacphaccord_app2.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Revised Version of the Tunisian Solar Plan Vol. 2, ANME (2012)



Output 1.2: Establishment of a Secretariat to coordinate energy generation and end-use stakeholders for the TSP NAMA, accompanied by recommendations and the implementation of economic and financial tools and instruments (Output 1.3) to support the implementation of the TSP NAMA

Output 1.3: Use of system dynamics modelling (SDM), DREI analysis and scenario analysis to investigate (i) the sectoral emissions reduction potential of the TSP to 2030, (ii) cross-sectoral co-benefits, such as job creation and contribution to economic growth, and (iii) the cost-effectiveness of public instruments identified in Output 1.2 for de-risking investments in the TSP

Component 2: Architecture for NAMA development is established.

Expected outcome: A coherent climate finance framework is established for the development of NAMAs to catalyse the transformational capacity of the TSP to generate large emission reductions.

This technical assistance component seeks to establish the necessary conditions to leverage financing to support a NAMA in the energy sector – i.e. the TSP NAMA through development of a technology action plan (TAP) for each of the three technologies proposed in the TSP (i.e. solar PV, wind and CSP). Each TAP is expected to carry out a detailed investment analysis based on the tools and methodologies developed under Components 1 and 2. This component also addresses regulatory and technical barriers – such as deficiencies in the legal framework for public-private partnerships and the absence of a comprehensive grid code for grid-connected renewable energy that constrains private investment.

The outcome of Component 2 is to be achieved through the following outputs:

Output 2.1: Development of a set of guidelines to establish national NAMA eligibility and design criteria

Output 2.2: Provision of technical support to strengthen the institutional structures of the Ministry of Equipment, Land Planning and Sustainable Development as the national coordinating institution and quality assurer for NAMAs

Output 2.3: Establishment of a standardised baseline for calculating emission reductions from grid-connected renewable energy through development of a tool for annually updating the emission factor of the national electricity system

Output 2.4: The development and implementation of the proposed legal framework, including: (1) a Public-Private Partnership Act, (2) a grid code for RES, and (3) an Independent Energy Regulator to promote private investment to support implementation of the TSP NAMA

Output 2.5: Development of three comprehensive sectoral NAMA action plans for PV, wind and CSP

Output 2.6: Support to the Energy Transition Fund to facilitate NAMA implementation, and analysis of the following financial instruments to capitalise the fund: concessional loans, green credit lines, fiscal incentives, donor contributions, a carbon tax, and climate finance

Output 2.7: Development and implementation of a territorial performance-based finance instrument (a ‘proxy FiT’ combined with public de-risking instruments) to catalyse investment for NAMA implementation

Output 2.8: Development of guidelines for environmental and social safeguards of utility scale RE projects implemented under the TSP NAMA, based on international benchmarks (e.g. World Bank)

Output 2.9: Communication of lessons-learned, experiences and best practices relating to the development of energy NAMAs compiled and disseminated (website, publications, manuals, participation in national, regional and international conferences and fora etc.) for operationalising MENA national solar plans (e.g. Morocco, Jordan, Egypt) and to demonstrate an architecture for leveraging private investments and climate finance

Component 3: Design and implementation of an energy sector NAMA to demonstrate the transformational role of the Tunisian Solar Plan to reduce emissions.

Expected outcome: The TSP is operationalised by demonstrating a proof-of-concept energy NAMA with quantified GHG emission reductions.

This investment component of the project aims at the three principal impacts: (1) the reliability of renewable electricity generation from the two baseline projects (the 10 MW Tozeur solar plant and the 24 MW Gabes wind farm) thereby ensuring enhanced GHG emission reduction capabilities; (2) the two baseline projects implemented as part of the TSP NAMA, with appropriate MRV of emission reductions; and (3) calibration of the territorial performance-based mechanism (Output 2.7) to be developed in conjunction with the two baseline projects.

There is one output for achievement of the outcome:

Output 3.1: One private-sector supported wind energy project (Gabes 24 MW grid-connected wind farm) and one public-sector supported PV project (Tozeur 10 MW PV) implemented to validate the adopted framework and methodologies.

The complete project results framework is provided as Annex 2.

### Barriers at the project inception

The Project Document outlines several barriers to development of NAMA as well as their root causes and shows how these are addressed by the project through linking the barriers with the outputs described in the project Results Framework.

- Legal and regulatory barriers: The baseline conditions do not provide sufficient visibility for investors to invest in renewable energy technologies on the scale required for achievement of the ambitious goals of the TSP.
- Institutional and policy barriers: In the absence of a coherent and integrated renewable energy (RE) policy and related supporting policy instruments, there is no transparent and uniformly applicable system in place to allow Tunisia to embark on a low emission development pathway.

- Information and awareness barriers: Lack of knowledge and negative perception of RE technologies supported in the TSP exist among decision-makers, the banking sector, the energy sector community, and the general public.
- Technical barriers: There is lack of technical capacity related to each type of the technology proposed under the TSP.
- Financial and project implementation barriers: The RE technologies proposed by the TSP have high investment costs. There is lack of credible data concerning the best sites for installing solar technologies and insufficient understanding of potential assistance of emerging climate finance schemes, such as sectoral crediting and NAMAs, for implementation of the TSP.

### Project theory of change

A project's theory of change provides a basis for evaluation of the project resources, activities and results. The terminal evaluation will assess description of the project's theory of change including description of the project's outputs, outcomes, intended long-term environmental impacts of the project, causal pathways for the long-term impacts as well as implicit and explicit assumptions.

There is no explicit theory of change in the Project Document that would demonstrate the relation between individual project components. However the project design is based on the De-risking Renewable Energy Investment (DREI) methodology, developed by UNDP<sup>6</sup>. The theory of change underlying the DREI methodology is that one of the principal challenges for scaling-up renewable energy sources (RES) in developing countries is to lower the financing costs that affect renewables' competitiveness against baseline technologies – i.e., primarily fossil fuels. As these higher financing costs reflect barriers and associated risks in the investment environment, the key entry point for policymakers to promote RES is to address these risks and thereby lower the overall life-cycle costs of RES. Taking this approach, the DREI methodology allows policymakers to quantitatively compare different packages of measures to promote renewable energy and to compare their cost-effectiveness. The DREI methodology used in the preparation of the project included active outreach to the private sector with the aim to solicit its quantitative feedback on the barriers and investment risks to renewable energy in Tunisia.

### Stakeholder analysis at the project inception

Stakeholder engagement is an inclusive and continuous process between a project and those potentially impacted that encompasses a range of activities and approaches. It is arguably one of the most important ingredients for a successful project delivery and therefore an essential element of the project.

The design of the project was based on multi-stakeholder engagement as a key consideration in for two principal reasons: (1) the 'meta-technology' characteristics of the power sector imply a

---

<sup>6</sup> De- Risking Renewable Energy Investment: A Framework to Support Policymakers in Selecting Public Instruments to Promote Renewable Energy Investment in Developing Countries, UNDP, (2013),

diverse set of stakeholders from the public sector, the private sector and civil society are directly involved across the value chain spanning electricity generation to end-users; and (2) to ensure national institutional ownership that will aid the successful implementation of the project. The stakeholders listed below were actively engaged in preparation of the project:

- National Agency for Energy Conservation (ANME)
- Directorate General for Energy (DGE)
- Société Tunisienne de l'Électricité et du Gaz (STEG)
- Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF)
- Ministry of Equipment, Land Planning and Sustainable Development (MELPSD)
- Private sector – Tunisian Union of Industry, Trade and Handicrafts (UTICA), and EnerCiel & Cimenterie de Gabes
- NGOs
- The Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)/ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)

A list of stakeholders as well as their expected roles in the project implementation as conducted in the stakeholder analysis at project inception is provided as Annex 3.

### Cross-cutting issues

The Project Document does not mention any specific activities related to cross-cutting issues such as gender or human rights, and it was expected that the project would have a marginal positive impact on gender equality and women's empowerment.

The evaluation will assess whether Gender and vulnerability issues were taken in account in the implementation and to what extent the project contributed to the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan (SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI).

### Management arrangements

The legal framework for implementation of the project is the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of Tunisia and the UNDP. The project was designed to be implemented under the National Implementation Modality (NIM) with full support from UNDP whereby the National Agency for Energy Conservation (ANME) is the national implementing partner on behalf of the Government of Tunisia. As the executing entity/implementing partner, the ANME:

- Assumes full responsibility for the effective use of UNDP resources and the delivery of outputs stipulated in the signed Project Document;
- Reports on project progress against agreed work plans in accordance with the reporting schedule and formats included in the project document; and
- Maintains documentation and evidence of the proper and prudent use of project resources in conformity to the project document and in accordance with applicable regulations and procedures.

Under the NIM, the UNDP is accountable for the effective and efficient use of resources for the achievement of programme results in conjunction with the implementing partner. UNDP maintains the oversight and management of the overall project budget and is responsible for

monitoring project implementation, preparation of obligatory reports to GEF and for organising mandatory evaluations.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established at the inception of the project to provide strategic guidance to the project implementation as well as an oversight function in relation to achievement of the project outputs and use of the project resources. The PSC consists of key project stakeholders.

A Project Management Unit (PMU), based within ANME, carries out the day-to-day management of the project. The PMU is led by the Project Manager (PM) that reports to UNDP, the executing agency (ANME) and the PSC.

### **Sustainability and replicability**

The Project Document stipulates that the sustainability of the TSP NAMA project is based on the fact that it originates from the Government of Tunisia's willingness to establish long-term climate change mitigation targets. The conceptual framework of the project seeks sustainability by migrating from a conventional, project-based approach to a sector-wide transformational approach including the testing and implementation of novel policy instruments to develop a related stable policy framework for scale-up of the long-term diffusion of renewable energy technologies. Furthermore, the concept of NAMAs as a means to engage non-Annex 1 countries in mitigation efforts is embedded in the UNFCCC discussions and negotiations. Therefore, the conceptual framework of the project was further considered sustainable due to the expectation that NAMAs will form an important part of Tunisia's communications to the UNFCCC. By linking GHG reduction opportunities and national development priorities, the TSP NAMA was proposed as a template for replication through other NAMA activities in the energy sector.

### **Evaluation scope and methodology**

The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by GEF and UNDP as stipulated in the GEF Guidance for Terminal Evaluations and UNDP Evaluation Guidelines as well as in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects as established in the Terms of Reference for the TE.

The evaluation will use a participatory and consultative approach to inform and consult with all key stakeholders associated with the project, in particular representatives of relevant agencies of the Government, the GEF operational focal point, the UNDP Country Office, the National Project Team, the UNDP/GEF Technical Adviser, as well as representatives of cooperating agencies and consultants.

The evaluation methodology is aimed at providing evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful based on predetermined objective evaluation criteria.

### **Evaluation criteria**

The evaluation will use the primary evaluation criteria listed in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of interventions. Since it may take some time for the impacts to be realized, the evaluation will aim at determining the level of progress towards realization of planned impacts.

A conceptual framework of methodology for assessment under the primary evaluation criteria is provided below:

### *Relevance*

#### Conceptualization/Design

The evaluation will assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal risks in the project area. It will also include an assessment of the project logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. Furthermore, it will assess the effectiveness of the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measuring the achievement of project objectives. The TE will also assess whether lessons learned from other relevant projects (e.g., projects with the same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

#### Country ownership and stakeholder participation

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national and sectoral development plans and to what extent it focused on national environment and development interests, including changes over time. It will also provide assessment of information dissemination, consultation, and stakeholder participation in design stages of the project.

#### Replication and linkages

The evaluation will determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this is also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation). It will look at linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage. This element should also address the question of to what extent the project addressed UNDP priorities and cross-cutting issues such as gender, south-south cooperation, and poverty-environment linkages (sustainable livelihoods). It will also examine linkages between the project and the UNDP normative programming instruments and response of the UN system to national development priorities in the form of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the Country Programm document (CPD) for the recipient country.

### *Effectiveness and efficiency*

#### Implementation approach

This part of the evaluation will include assessments of the following aspects:

- The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to the framework as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities if required;
- Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation;

- The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives;
- Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

### Monitoring and evaluation

Under the M&E framework, the evaluation will include an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

### Stakeholder participation

This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

- The production and dissemination of information and lessons generated by the project;
- Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this field;
- The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation;
- Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation and the extent of governmental support to the project.

### Financial planning and procurement management

The assessment in the field of financial planning will look into the actual project cost by objectives/outputs/activities and the cost-effectiveness of achievements, financial management (including disbursement issues) as well as co-financing of the project. It will assess technical and human resource capacity for procurement, linkage between work programming and procurement planning and budgeting as well as effectiveness of procurement management.

### *Assessment of project results*

The GEF Evaluation Policy (2019)<sup>7</sup> as well as the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines<sup>8</sup> specify that terminal evaluations will, at the minimum, assess achievement of outputs and outcomes, and report on these. While assessing a project's results, the evaluation will determine the extent to

---

<sup>7</sup> GEF Evaluation Policy, GEF/ME/C.56/02/Rev.01

<sup>8</sup> UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, UNDP/(2019)

Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, UNDP (2020)

which the project objectives – as stated in the documents submitted at the GEF CEO Endorsement stage – have been achieved. The evaluation will also indicate if there were any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator will estimate the baseline conditions to the extent possible.

#### *Attainment of outcomes/ Achievement of objectives*

Through review of the project results framework, the evaluation will revisit the original outcome model (also known as the results map) in the Project Document and examine the causal logic of the initiative under evaluation and whether and eventually how it developed during the life of the project. The revisited outcome model will establish a map that captures knowledge of project stakeholders and boundary partners about how an outcome is intended to be achieved. The model will also identify the intended target group of the initiative at the outcome level and the expected changes that the initiatives will contribute to. The model will thus include a description of the project's own contribution, what it contributed with partners, what the partners may do independently, and what non-partners might do. It will also examine any significant unexpected positive as well as negative effects of the project.

A summary in a tabular format will be provided that will use the indicators for the tracking and assessment of the planned results (outcomes and objective) with evidence of the delivered results as a basis for rating of achievement of the results.

#### *Sustainability*

The assessment of sustainability will include an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to end as well as eventual development of a sustainability strategy.

The likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes will be assessed in terms the following aspects:

- Financial sustainability
- Socio-political sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance sustainability
- Environmental sustainability

Each of the above sustainability dimensions will be assigned a separate rating and an overall rating for sustainability will be assigned at the level of the lowest individual rating given.

#### *Impact*

It is often too early to assess long-term impacts of GEF projects at the point of project completion hence the evaluation will assess whether there is any evidence on progress towards long-term impacts as well as the extent to which the key assumptions of the project's theory of change hold and the extent to which the eventual progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project.

In doing so, the evaluation will review the project's intended impacts described in the project documentation in order to determine whether the project logic is consistent with the expected



impacts. This will be done through a review of the project's logical framework and analysis of the project's outcomes-impacts pathways, particularly, to which extent transitional conditions between the project's outcomes and impacts have been or are likely to be achieved. It will also examine significant factors, both within and outside the project ability to influence, that are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts (also known as impact drivers and assumptions).

The immediate impact of the project, in terms of GEF objectives, is the reduction in the GHG emission. The evaluation will determine the cumulative, direct GHG emission reduction resulting from the implementation of the project and will determine to what extent the project, through its replication potential, has created foundations for indirect reductions in the GHG emissions in the post implementation phase. It will also try to estimate other related environmental and ecological co-benefits.

In addition to the analysis of progress to impacts in terms of available qualitative and quantitative evidence on environmental stress reduction, the evaluation will also examine the project's contributions to changes in policy/ legal/regulatory framework, including reported and/or observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and in access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies).

### *Other assessments*

The evaluations will assess the following additional topics for which ratings are not required:

- **Eventual need for follow-up:** Where applicable, the evaluation will indicate if there is any need to follow up on the evaluation findings, e.g. unintended negative impacts or risks, etc.
- **Materialization of co-financing:** the evaluation will provide information on the extent to which expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing was cash or in-kind, whether it is in form of grant or loan or equity, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization, how short fall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc.
- **Gender Concerns:** The evaluation will find out the extent to which the gender considerations were taken into account in designing and implementing the project, the extent to which the project was implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits, and whether gender disaggregated data was eventually gathered and reported on beneficiaries.

### *Rating*

The primary evaluation criteria, the related evaluation questions, the data sources required to answer the questions, and the data collection methods have been systematically linked into the Evaluation Matrix that is provided as Annex 4.

The evaluation of the project performance will be conducted against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework. The Results Framework provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of

verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

Ratings will be provided on the performance criteria provided in the Table 1 below according to the GEF obligatory rating scales under the particular categories provided in Annex 5.

**Table 1:** Evaluation rating requirements

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA &amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

### Evaluation methodology

The evaluation will be conducted in three phases as follows:

#### *Preparation*

As an initial step and part of this report preparation, an initial desk review has been conducted of a variety of documents mainly those covering project design and implementation progress. The approved Project Document (ProDoc) was the starting point for the review in terms of understanding the basics on which the project was designed and funded. Study of the ProDoc is complemented by the review of other essential information resources such as the Minutes of the Inception Workshop and the annual GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs).

The initial review results provide grounds for formulation of evaluation questions as discussion points that aim at gathering information from project stakeholders and beneficiaries about their attitudes and preferences as well as collecting factual information from relevant sources linked to the performance indicators.

The evaluation questions have been incorporated into the Evaluation Matrix that will be used during the data collection stage.

#### *Data collection*

Collection of the first-hand information will be conducted through semi-structured interviews with selected project stakeholders. Since travel of the international consultant to Tunisia is not possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic, majority of the interviews will be performed remotely using the telecommuting modalities, such as internet meeting platforms.

The interviews will be designed to solicit responses to a set of predetermined open-ended questions aiming to obtain in-depth information about the key informants' experiences from the project implementation and their opinions on the achievement of the planned results. They

will be based on a semi-structured format in order to allow the respondents to express their perception of the main issues related to the project implementation.

The evaluation criteria and the questions will be used as a check list to raise eventual additional and/or more specific questions on the issues mentioned. Triangulation of results, i.e. comparing information from different sources, such as documentation and interviews, or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, will be used to corroborate or check the reliability of evidence. This approach will verify the information obtained in the document review phase, get some missing data and to learn about the opinion of stakeholders and project participants to interpret the information. In case some important stakeholders and/or beneficiaries will not be visited during the evaluation mission, their responses will be solicited *via* other means such as e-mail communications. The interviews will also serve the purpose of collecting some additional documents to support the evidence base of the evaluation. Time schedule for the interview and field visit will be discussed and determined with the project stakeholders. Meeting of both online and in field will be organized in order to effectively collect essential data for this evaluation.

It is suggested to interview at least the following project stakeholders listed in Box 1:

**Box 1:** Suggested project stakeholders to be interviewed

<b>Stakeholder or Facility</b>
UNDP CO Project Manager UNDP CO M&E Focal Point
UNDP RTA
Agence Nationale pour la Maitrise de l'Énergie (ANME) – National Project Director and National Project Coordinator
Ministry in charge of Energy, Department of Energy Management
Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment – GEF Operational Focal Point Representative of the ministry at the Project Steering Committee
Ministry of Economy, Finance and Investment Support
Union Tunisienne de l'Industrie du Commerce et de l'Artisanat (UTICA)
Association Tunisienne pour la Maîtrise de l'Énergie (ATME)
GIZ Tunisia
STEG (owner of the Tozeur PV plant)
UPC Renewable Tunisia, formerly Enerciel (owner of the Gabes wind farm)

In parallel with the interviews, the Evaluator will perform a detailed review and analysis of the available project substantive and financial progress reports, minutes of the Project Board as well as other documents relevant for the evaluation. Documents from similar and complementary initiatives, as well as reports on the specific context of the project.

***Assessment of Evaluation Evidence***

After the data collection phase with conducting interviews and reviewing data from the available data sources, data analysis will follow as the final stage of the evaluation, including documents prepared during the preparation phase, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The Evaluator will

take perspectives of all relevant stakeholders into account and gather information on project performance and results from multiple sources including the project M&E system, tracking tools, field visit, stakeholder interviews, project documents, and other independent sources, in order to facilitate triangulation of the data. Contextual information will also be gathered to assess the significance and relevance of the observed performance and results.

The collected information will be organized, classified, tabulated, summarized and compared with other appropriate information to extract useful information that responds to the evaluation questions and fulfils the purposes of the evaluation. In view of the nature of evaluation questions and use of predominantly qualitative assessment approach, the collected data will be processed using validation, triangulation, interpretation and abstraction techniques. It is the process of deciphering facts from a body of evidence by systematically coding and collating the data collected, ensuring its accuracy, and translating the data into usable formats or units of analysis related to each evaluation question.

### *Limitations to the evaluation*

Evaluation consultants use direct observation for gathering additional information, triangulating previously obtained information, validating available statistics and theoretical data as well as getting a broader picture of the project under evaluation. Since visit of the international consultant is not possible and the consultant is limited to discuss the data through internet, it will require additional effort to reduce the negative effect of the lack of access to the project sites on the quality of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

### Evaluation timeframe

The evaluation time frame contained in the ToR was revised in order to optimize the use of the available time for the above three phases. The revised evaluation timeframe is in the Table 3 below.

**Table 3:** Evaluation time frame (if the field visit as well as the interview is postponed, TE report date may be extended)

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Deadline for completion</b>
Submission of the Inception Report	23 August
Completion of evaluation interviews	10 September
Presentation of initial findings	17 September
Submission of draft final TE Report	
Submission and approval of revised final TE Report	30 September

### Evaluation report format

The main deliverable of TE is the Evaluation Report. A tentative outline of the Evaluation Report is provided as Annex 6.

Apart from the findings part of the TE Report discussed above, under the Scope of the Evaluation, the last part of the TE report will be devoted to interpretation of findings and making conclusions and recommendations.

Interpretation of findings is the process of giving meaning to the evaluation findings derived from the analysis of the information collected during the different stages of the evaluation. It extracts from the summation and synthesis of information derived from facts, statements, opinions, and documents and turns findings from the data into judgements about development results (conclusions). Interpretation is the effort of figuring out what the findings mean—making sense of the evidence gathered in an evaluation and its practical applications towards development effectiveness.

A conclusion is a reasoned judgement based on a synthesis of empirical findings or factual statements corresponding to specific circumstances. Conclusions will be directly linked to the factual evidence and justified on the basis of appropriate methods of analysis and synthesis to summarize findings and will serve as a basis for recommending actions or decisions consistent with the conclusions.

On the basis of the conclusions, recommendations for future actions will be made as evidence-based proposals for action aimed at evaluation users. The recommendations will be formulated in a way that will facilitate the development of a management response, i.e. will be realistic and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up. Each recommendation will identify its target group and stipulate the recommended action and rationale.

In addition to standard conclusions and recommendations, the evaluation report will also contain few lessons based on the project experience and applicable to the type of project at hand, to the GEF's overall portfolio, and/or to GEF systems and processes. To the extent possible, the TE report will include examples of good practices in project design and implementation that have led to effective stakeholder engagement, successful broader adoption of GEF initiatives by stakeholders, and large-scale environmental impacts. The evaluator will also describe aspects of the project performance that worked well along with reasons for it and discuss where these good practices may or may not be replicated.

### **Evaluation team composition**

As specified in the ToR, the evaluation will be conducted by one evaluator. The UNDP CO in Tunisia as the unit commissioning this TE has recruited Mr. Dalibor Kysela, based in Vienna, Austria, as the International Evaluation Consultant.

This Inception Report was prepared upon consultation of the documents listed in Annex 7.

### **Evaluation ethics**

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations.

## Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan (PIMS #5182)*.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan</b>		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5182	PIF Approval Date:	20 June 2013
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	5340	CEO Endorsement Date:	19 November 2014
ATLAS Business Unit, Award #	TUN10	Project Document	
Proj. ID:	00081769 00090941	(ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	6 January 2015
Country(ies):	TUNISIA	Date project manager hired:	1 September 2015
Region:	Arab States	Inception Workshop date:	8 September 2015
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Mid-term Review completion date:	22 May 2018
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	CCM Objective 3 (GEF-5)	Planned planned closing date:	6 January 2020 (but a 9-month no-cost extension has been requested)
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF Trust Fund	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	National Agency for Energy Conservation of Tunisia (Agence Nationale pour la Maitrise de l'énergie ANME)		
Other execution partners:	NA		

### PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The key focus of the UNDP-supported, GEF-financed project, NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan (hereafter, 'the Project'), is to capacitate Tunisia to implement the Tunisian Solar Plan (TSP) to its full potential – i.e. to achieve 30% renewable electricity generation by 2030 using photovoltaics (PV), wind and concentrated solar power (CSP). A traditional siloed, stand-alone approach, though useful, is not sufficient to achieve this ambitious target. Instead, the Project aims to put in place the institutional and policy frameworks necessary to coordinate and support the up-scaling of renewable electricity in Tunisia, as well as developing an architecture for implementing these actions within a NAMA framework. GEF funding is being used incrementally to create the appropriate institutional, policy and capacity environment in which the two identified (and enhanced) baseline investment projects are embedded, thereby enhancing their probability of successful implementation as supported NAMAs.

The Project consists of three components:

- Component 1: The enabling framework and methodologies are established to support implementation of the Tunisian Solar Plan.
- Component 2: Architecture for NAMA development is established.
- Component 3: Design and implementation of renewable energy NAMAs to demonstrate the transformational role of the Tunisian Solar Plan to reduce emissions.

Within its duration, the Project aims to generate 16.9 GWh by a PV plant and 86.4 GWh by a wind farm, thereby reducing direct emissions of 218,900 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e between 2016 and end of 2019. The project is being implemented by UNDP Tunisia and the executing agency is ANME.

The project's main stakeholders include the GEF as well as the members of the steering committee, which consist of ANME, Ministry in charge of Energy, the Ministry of Finance, the Tunisian Company of Electricity and Gas (STEG), Ministry of Development and International Cooperation, , Ministry of Equipment and Sustainable Development, Tunisian Confederation of Industry, Trade and Handicrafts (UTICA), ATME and the Project Manager.

The day-to-day management of the Project is being carried out by a project management unit consisting of one full-time project manager, one full-time project assistant and one full-time logistics assistant. The PMU is located in the premises of ANME, in Tunis. The project has also realized missions outside of the capital Tunis, such as in the south of Tunisia, or more specifically in the mountains "Jebel Abderrahmen" and "Jebel Tbagha". The Initial implementation period of the project was 5 years from 05 January 2015 until the 05 of January 2020 and was extended after a request from the national partners and the approval of the GEF to the 07 of July 2021.

The project contributes support and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development objectives and more specifically it contributes to the achievement of the **SDG 7**: Guarantee access for all to reliable, sustainable and modern energy services, affordable, as well as **SDG 13**: Take Urgent Action to Address Climate Change and its Impacts.

The NAMA project to support the Tunisian Solar Plan is supporting the achievement of Outcome 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development of the **UNDP Global Strategic Plan 2018-2021**. More specifically to Output 2.5.1: Solutions developed, financed and applied on a large scale for energy efficiency and transformation into clean energy and in zero carbon development, for poverty eradication and structural transformation.

At the level of 2015-2020 country program: **United Nations Development Assistance Framework, UNDAF / country programme document**, NAMA is directly involved to reach effect N° 4 By 2019, regional actors manage efficiently and optimally, sustainably and inclusive use regional resources. CPD Product 4.3. Strategies for low-carbon development, based on improved energy efficiency, are supported at national and local levels and in the **country programme action plan** product 4.3.1. The energy conservation potential is managed effectively and efficiently at the regional level and local communities fully contribute to the energy transition process for sustainable low-carbon development through permanent dialogue.

Tunisia, officially hit by the COVID-19 pandemic since March 2, 2020, has not escaped the global trend. Although the health impact of the pandemic was less severe than in other countries, with 143 544 cases including 4800 deaths, the fact remains that its ecological, economic and social impact has hit a society already weakened by years of political transition which remains uncompleted. Indeed, the pandemic has exacerbated latent tensions, and exposed the structural vulnerabilities from which the country suffers, and which make its resilience capacities in the face of crises of this magnitude rather uncertain.

The expansion of the Pandemic Coronavirus in the world from February 2020 has slowed down the work. Official confinement was declared by the Government from March to April (2 months) then new measures were announced late October to stem the rapid spread of the virus in the country including a national curfew, the suspension of all private and public activities as well as gatherings, the suspension of classes in schools, colleges, high schools and universities and the suspension of prayers in mosques. This situation directly impacted stakeholders' consultations for most of the project activities. Key partners that are involved in the implementation and strategic orientations of the project have limited means of remote communication. Also, all the recruiting processes launched during this Covid 19 periods have been extended, at the request of potential suppliers/consultants as they find it difficult to provide the administrative documents requested in the tenders due to lockdown and difficulties to deal with their counterparts. Remote work impacted several consultancy bureaus and they didn't manage to respect the tender's deadlines.

The project PMU adopted adaptative strategies and way to work and to achieve results on time and on budget during the COVID lockdown. The project unit continued to work closely with the national project coordinator and

key stakeholders and ensured a daily management of the project. In addition, exchange and interaction with the various UNDP CO departments, such as purchasing, finance and security were and continue to be ensured. Continuous and close monitoring is conducted with the team leader of the Environment and Climate Change Cluster.

Due to COVID-19 (Containment, displacement and assembly bans ...), many of the project activities were delayed and the involvement of the project partners were compromised. Indeed, the implementation of the project consultation and exchange for the validation of deliverables was done, when possible, remotely through e-mails and Zoom/Skype meetings. However, it is important to point the lack of means of communication such as laptops and internet connections for the partners when working remotely.

In addition, the NAMA was adapted to the pandemic context so that it can actively contribute and support the exit strategy that will have to be deployed after the Covid 19 health crisis. The climate action is not a barrier to the crisis, but an effective response to the demand for resilience that will emerge.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE TE**

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'.

The TE will evaluate the project from its initiation on January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015 to its operational closing date on July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

The TE report will

- Evaluate the project's design, implementation and results
- Assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved as specified in the project document
- Assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;
- Examination on the use of funds and value for money and to draw lessons learned and best practices that can ensure the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming and projects.
- Promote accountability and transparency
- Assess the extent of the project's accomplishments, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance in terms of communication, advocacy, and improving the energy system in Tunisia, including but not limited to renewable energies, photovoltaics, wind and concentrated solar power.

Assess the project's handling of risks, in particular the impact of Covid-19 on the project's results and the energy system in Tunisia. This will provide support to the Tunisian Government, as part of the UNDP's offer in terms of response to COVID in the energy sector (UNDP's Integrated Response to COVID-19 / Energy Offer , to ensure a more resilient COVID 19 recovery integrating the opportunities and challenges of the Tunisian energy transition.

---

### **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has been developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163



The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Tunis, Tunisia. Interviews will be held with at least the following organizations and individuals:

- The Steering committee members
- The GEF Focal Point
- Representatives of UNDP Country Office and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor
- Representatives of consultants

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

Since November 2020, travel to the country is limited, and travel within the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to the country or to move within the country for the TE mission, the TE team should develop a methodology taking this situation into account and plan to conduct the assessment remotely and virtually, including through remote interview methods and in-depth document reviews, data analysis, surveys and assessment questionnaires. This point should be detailed in EF's initial report and agreed with the mandating unit.

If all or part of the TE should be done virtually, the availability, capacity or willingness of stakeholders to be interviewed remotely should be taken into account. In addition, access to the Internet or a computer can be a problem because many governmental and national parties might work from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final report of TE.

If data collection / field mission is not possible, then the interviews could be done remotely by phone or online (Skype, Zoom, Microsoft teams etc.). International consultants can work remotely with on-site support evaluators since they are able to intervene and move safely. No stakeholder, consultant or UNDP staff member can be put at risk and safety is the top priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is deemed to be safe for staff, consultants and stakeholders, and if the TE schedule allows. Likewise, qualified and independent national consultants can be recruited to conduct the TE and interviews in the country, if their safety is guaranteed.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation and data analysis approach should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed with UNDP and the project stakeholders. The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex F

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

### Findings

- i. Project Design/Formulation
  - National priorities and country driven-ness
  - Theory of Change
  - Gender equality and women's empowerment

- Social and Environmental Safeguards
  - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
  - ii. Project Implementation
    - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
    - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
    - Project Finance and Co-finance
    - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
    - Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
    - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards
  - iii. Project Results
    - Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
    - Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
    - Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
    - Country ownership
    - Gender equality and women's empowerment
    - Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
    - GEF Additionality
    - Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
    - Progress to impact
- Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned
- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
  - The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
  - Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
  - The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions.

When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.

- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below

**Evaluation Ratings:**

1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	

M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>rating</b>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>rating</b>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)		UNDP own financing		Government		Other Partners		Total	
		(mill.US\$ )		(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)	
		Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants		600,000	0	14,606,640		49,976,000		65,182,640	
Loans/Concessions		0	0	0		0	0	0	
•	In-kind support	0	0	200,000	200,000	0	0	200,000	
•	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Totals		600,000	0	14,806,640		0	0	65,382,640	

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## GENDER & CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are key elements in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should align with UNDP country programme strategies, SDGs, as well as with GEF-required global environmental benefits as outlined in global environmental conventions. TE reports must, therefore, assess how projects are successfully mainstreaming other UNDP priorities, including but not limited to: poverty alleviation, gender equality and empowerment of women, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, and capacity development, etc., as applicable.

TE teams will need to review relevant country programme documents (UNDP CPD, UNDAF, UNSDCF, etc.). A project's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) documents, including but not limited to the SESP, will also be highly relevant.

Assessment of gender equality should be present throughout a TE report. Gender results are defined as project outputs or outcomes that have been found to be contributing (positively or negatively) to gender equality and women's empowerment. The gender results of a GEF-financed project would include results planned for as part

of the gender action plan and project results framework, as well as any other unplanned gender results produced by project activities.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated:

a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the UNDP CO in Tunisia. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the UNDP Country Office.

The UNDP CO in Tunisia will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 22 working days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	02 days	11 june 2021
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	9 days	20 june 2021
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	8 days	28 june 2021
<b>Final Report</b>	3 days	01 july 2021

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>TE Inception Report</b>	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission	TE team submits Inception Report to UNDP CO and project management
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of TE mission	TE team presents to UNDP CO and project management
<b>Draft TE Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	TE team submits draft to UNDP CO; draft is reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
<b>Final TE Report + Audit Trail</b>	Revised final report and TE Audit Trail that details how all received comments have (or have not) been addressed in	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	TE team submits both documents to the UNDP CO.

	the final report.		
--	-------------------	--	--

## TE TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international Evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The selection of evaluator will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

- Post graduate degree (minimum Master's degree or equivalent degree) in energy, energy studies engineering, environmental science or management, climate change, economics or other closely related field;
- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Proven 10 years of experience of evaluating similar energy-related projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN agencies, development Agencies or major donors
- At least 10 years of work experience in the areas related to climate change mitigation and/or energy efficiency / renewable energies;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience working with government, particularly with projects under National Implementation is an asset.
- Fluency in written and spoken French and English.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#) The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	Upon submission and approval of final TE Inception Report
50%	Upon submission and approval of draft TE report
30%	Upon submission and approval of final TE report + TE Audit Trail (TE Report Clearance form must be signed by UNDP CO and RTA)

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

## APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>3</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>4</sup>);
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted or by email at the following address ONLY: [procurement.tn@undp.org](mailto:procurement.tn@undp.org) by (*time and date*) indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of "NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan ". Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

---

## TOR ANNEXES

*(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)*

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex D: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Report Outline
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail
- ToR Annex I: Terms of reference

## Annex 2: Project Results Framework

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD:</b> Outcome 3: By 2019, the State has put in place a new economic and socially-equitable development model that is inclusive, sustainable and resilient, and generating wealth and jobs; Outcome 4: By 2019, regional stakeholders generate efficiently and use optimally, sustainably and inclusively the resources in regions.					
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Number of regional development plans integrating region-specific potentials and environmental dimensions; contracts in place to enable the reinforced autonomy of regions with financial resources and the necessary human resources					
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area):</b> Sustainable Development					
<b>GEF Focal Area Objective: GEF-5 FA Objective: #3 (CCM-3):</b> “Promote Investment in Renewable Energy Technologies”					
<b>Objective/ Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>Objective:</b> Tunisia’s energy sector for achieving emission reductions through the deployment of a TSP NAMA.	A NAMA developed for the TSP Quantity of renewable Electricity generated by on-grid baseline projects (MWh/year) Quantity of direct GHG Emissions resulting from the baseline projects and TSP NAMA (tCO2/year)	No NAMA for the energy sector No MRV system for monitoring GHG emission reductions in the energy sector Proposed Gabes and Tozeur RE plants become operational but with deficiencies (e.g. PV plant not designed for desert conditions; weak interface between RE plants and the national grid)	A NAMA developed for the TSP and submitted for registration with the UNFCCC NAMA Registry 16.9 GWh/yr is generated by 10 MW PV plant at Tozeur; and 86.4 GWh/yr is generated by 24 MW wind farm at Gabes Emissions reductions: Total direct emission reductions of 218,900 tonnes CO2e between 2016 and 2019	Project reports (Quarterly, Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) Minutes of PSC UNFCCC NAMA Registry Energy sector inventory report (First and National Inventory Reports) MRV mechanism or technology-specific mechanisms	The Government of Tunisia maintains its commitment to voluntary GHG abatement initiatives through NAMAs, especially in the energy sector Detailed sectoral inventory established and operational in collaboration with GIZ MRV mechanism(s) developed in collaboration with the PMR initiative
<b>Outcome 1:</b> The enabling conditions, methodologies and tools are developed for de-risking the national policy environment for implementing the Tunisian Solar Plan through a TSP NAMA	Number of committees established and operational Energy sector system dynamics model developed and implemented Number of policy and financial de-risking instruments designed using DREI analysis an implemented	No high-level Inter-Ministerial TSP NAMA Committee No cross-sectoral modelling tool exists to investigate the sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) dividends of the energy sector No methodology is used to quantify risks that hinder investments in RE, and to develop policy and financial de-risking instruments to promote large-scale private investments	A high-level Inter-Ministerial TSP NAMA Committee is established A system dynamics model is developed and implemented for the energy sector At least 4 policy and financial de-risking instruments have been developed using DREI analysis based on work initiated in the development of the project document	Project reports (Quarterly, Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) Reports on SDM for energy sector DREI reports	The Government of Tunisia maintains its commitment to voluntary GHG abatement initiatives through NAMAs, especially in the energy sector Continued commitment of the GoT to use an evidence-based approach to advocate for the sustainable development benefits of the TSP NAMA

<p><b>Outcome2:</b> A coherent climate finance framework is established for the development of the TSP NAMA to catalyse the transformational capacity of the TSP to generate large emission reductions</p>	<p>Number of national guidelines Number of technical codes Number of regulations Number of financial instruments to capitalise the Energy Transition Fund</p>	<p>Guidelines and SD criteria exist for CDM projects but not for NAMAs Low institutional capacity of MELPSD to act as the coordinating body and quality assurer for NAMAs in Tunisia PPPs for developing RE projects do not exist No grid code for RES is available publicly to project developers No energy regulator exists in Tunisia' FNME restructured into the ETF in January 2014 (Articles 67 and 68 of the Finance Law 2014) Diversified sources of capitalisation not sufficient to support the implementation of the TSP NAMA No social and environmental safeguards required under current legislation for projects with installed capacity below 300 MW</p>	<p>A set of guidelines and design criteria is developed for all NAMAs by the end of Year 1; a set of social and environmental safeguard guidelines is developed for all utility-scale RE by the middle of Year 2 based on international standards A grid code is approved by stakeholders and made publicly available by the end of Year 2 Modalities for PPPs are established in regulations, and the establishment of an IER is supported The ETF is supported with at least 3 new financial instruments</p>	<p>Report on standardized baseline tool development and user manual Project reports (Quarterly, Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) Minutes of PSC Legislation/decrees proclaimed Grid code IER charter or similar foundational document 3 TSP NAMA technology action plans Report detailing the design and establishment of the territorial performance-based mechanism Report on the design and operationalization of the environmental and social safeguard guidelines Lessons-learned report</p>	<p>GoT maintains its commitment to monitor, report and verify its voluntary NAMA initiatives GoT supports the facilitation of private-sector investment in the energy sector Institutional support of STEG is obtained GoT support for the establishment and operationalization of an IER ANME maintains its commitment to restructure the ETF GoT maintains its commitment to the sustainable development of Regions through the TSP NAMA</p>
<p><b>Outcome3:</b> The TSP is Operationalized by demonstrating a proof of- concept energy NAMA with quantified GHG emission reductions</p>	<p>Emission reductions from grid-connected wind and PV power Number of households benefiting from electricity generated by wind and PV plants (households/year)</p>	<p>Baseline projects implemented with identified deficiencies No MRV protocol / system for TSP NAMA</p>	<p>8,954 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year from 10 MW PV plant at Tozeur (35,815 tCO<sub>2</sub>e between 201 and 20 45,775 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year from 24 MW PV plant at Gabes (183,100 tCO<sub>2</sub>e between 2016 and 2019) Number of households benefiting from renewable energy by end of project 11,544 from PV; 50,016 from wind</p>	<p>Project reports (Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) and minutes of PSC</p>	<p>Baseline projects do not suffer major alterations in scope or financing Grid-connected, utility-scale private sector projects are supported through forthcoming RE Law Standardised baseline for national grid has been developed National MRV system is in place</p>



### Annex 3: Stakeholder Engagement Plan (at project inception)

Stakeholder	Roles and responsibilities (project preparation & implementation)
National Agency for Energy Conservation (ANME)	ANME has coordinated stakeholder consultations during preparation of the project. During the implementation phase, ANME will be the Executing Agency, will host the Project Management Unit (PMU) and will chair the Project Steering Committee (PSC). Building on previous work undertaken in conjunction with GIZ (NAMA Cement) and BMU (NAMA Buildings), ANME will support NAMA design and implementation. The UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project will coordinate very closely with GIZ-funded projects, namely (1) capacity development for GHG inventory and MRV in Tunisia, and (2) the setting up a project team for the Tunisian Solar Plan. Both projects are implemented by ANME. Another project that will be implemented by ANME and that will be closely coordinated with the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project is the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR). In particular, the development of an MRV mechanism for the energy sector will be of relevance.
Directorate General for Energy (DGE)	DGE is a department housed within the Ministry of Industry, tasked with developing the overall energy policy of the Government. Renewable energy policy, including the TSP, is an integral part of the overall energy policy. There is a long history of collaboration between ANME and DGE, especially regarding the technical aspects of energy policy and strategy development. The project team will work very closely with DGE for advocating policy and financial de-risking instruments that will be developed by the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project. DGE was involved in the project design stage, particularly with regard to the forthcoming RE Law.
Société Tunisienne de l'Électricité et du Gaz (STEG)	STEG has a quasi-monopoly in Tunisia on the generation, transmission and distribution of electricity. It is also owner of the 10 MW Tozeur PV project identified in the baseline. The UNDP-implemented, GEF financed project has been developed in close consultation with STEG. During project implementation, STEG will be responsible for implementing the 10 MW PV project at Tozeur, including participation in the design and implementation of the performance-based mechanism to promote RES based on a territorial approach (Annex 7.6), and with the view to delivering multiple sustainable development dividends. STEG will also be closely involved in baseline development for grid-connected RE projects forming part of the TSP NAMA, and in the design and implementation of the grid code. STEG is expected to play a key role in the design and operationalisation of an Independent Energy Regulator in Tunisia.
NGOs	Few NGOs are active in the field of renewable energy in Tunisia. The principal NGO active in this field is the Association Tunisienne pour la Maîtrise de l'Énergie (ATME), which was consulted during project development. During project implementation, and as an NGO representative, ATME will have an active role in the PSC. The Tunisian Wind Energy Association was also consulted during the project design phase. More specifically, the barriers and investment risks faced by proponents of wind energy were discussed with its members, as well as a discussion of the preliminary results of the Derisking Renewable Energy Investment (DREI) analysis that is presented in this Project Document and the accompanying DREI report for Tunisia.
Private sector – UTICA (Union Tunisienne de l'Industrie du Commerce et de l'Artisanat), and EnerCiel & Cimenterie de Gabes	Because of the prevailing barriers, there is currently limited private sector involvement in renewable energies in Tunisia. The most prominent private developer to date, UPC Wind/EnerCiel, has been heavily involved in preparation of the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project. Since UPC Wind/EnerCiel is also the owner of the Gabes wind farm baseline project, it will continue to be a key stakeholder throughout project implementation. Further, UPC Wind/EnerCiel will be a member of the Project Steering Committee. Cimenterie de Gabes will also be closely involved in project implementation since it is beneficiary of the wind farm at Gabes. In order to develop better linkages with the private sector, the project will also involve UTICA very closely in project implementation and M&E. UTICA is an umbrella organisation that represents large-scale and SME enterprises. It has a working group devoted to energy in industry and commerce.
Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF)	The Ministry of Economics and Finance will be involved in the establishment of climate financing mechanisms during project implementation. The Ministry is expected to be a key member of the high-level Inter-Ministerial Committee that will be established by the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project. It will also play a critical role in the design and administration of financial instruments to support implementation of renewable energy technologies and the means of capitalising the restructured Energy Transition Fund that is proposed in Component 2 of this project. The Ministry will also be involved in the design and implementation of the performance-based mechanism based on a territorial approach to promote RES.

Stakeholder	Roles and responsibilities (project preparation & implementation)
Ministry of Equipment, Land Planning and Sustainable Development (MELPSD)	The GEF Operational Focal Point and the DNA are hosted within the Ministry of Environment. The former was involved during the PIF and project preparation phases and will continue his involvement during project implementation. In the PPG phase, the members of the DNA Committee were consulted, especially regarding Outputs 2.1 and 2.2. The project will support the institutional structures of the Ministry to act as the national coordinating institution and provide quality assurance for NAMAs through dedicated training. In this capacity, the MELPSD is expected to be a key member of the Inter-Ministerial Committee that will be established by the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project to provide high-level political support for implementation of the TSP. A set of NAMA eligibility criteria will be developed by the project and will be used by MELPSD to screen NAMAs proposed in Tunisia.
GIZ/BMU	GIZ has been consulted throughout all the stages of project design and conceptualisation, specifically – but not exclusively – in regard to the projects discussed in Section 1.3.2. Since GIZ is working in close collaboration with ANME, seamless coordination with projects implemented by GIZ will be ensured. Further, lessons-learned from the GIZ projects will be drawn upon when implementing the UNDP- implemented, GEF-financed project.

## Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators</li> <li>The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>GEF 5 Focal Area Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project aligned to national development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>National development strategy, energy policies, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews of the project stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/ technical capacity and financial)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges have the planned results been achieved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project indicators are SMART</li> <li>Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are</li> <li>The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews of the project stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement.</li> <li>Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>SES Annex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project achieved its output and outcome level targets?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Site visit/field reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have lessons learned been captured and integrated into project planning and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validation Workshop Minutes (<i>if available</i>)</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the M&amp;E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The M&amp;E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded</li> <li>The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&amp;E tool</li> <li>There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality)</li> <li>Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>AWPs</li> <li>FACE forms</li> <li>Quarterly Narrative Reports</li> <li>Site visit reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were relevant counterparts from the Government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the Project Board?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Board participation included representatives from key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Board Minutes (<i>if available</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How effective were the partnership arrangements under the project and to what extent did they contribute to achievements of the project results?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A partnership framework has been developed that ensured coordination of parallel initiatives, involvement of key partners and identification of complementarities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>M&amp;E Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b></li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities</li> <li>Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation</li> <li>Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Project Board</li> <li>Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Project Board and donor, as required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Work Plans</li> <li>Validation Workshop Minutes</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Project Board meeting minutes (<i>if available</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the process of achieving results efficient? Did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? Were the resources effectively utilized?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project achieved the planned results in an efficient manner</li> <li>Funds used for project implementation were utilized affectively and contributed to achievement of project results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Workplans</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Project document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What were the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation modality?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project implementation followed the division of responsibilities between the project implementing partners in an efficient manner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates</li> <li>• Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified</li> <li>• Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans (AWPs)</li> <li>• Validation Workshop Minutes (<i>if available</i>)</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports, including financial reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, other donors and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality.</li> <li>• Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/ recruitment documents)</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings.</li> <li>• Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Audit Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b></li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there political, social or financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure sustainability of relevant activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Framework Document</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability and potential for replication?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure sustainability of relevant activities and identifies relevant factors requiring attention in the future</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Framework Document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Framework Document</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

	pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Framework Document</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Framework Document</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

## Annex 5: Performance Rating of GEF Projects

The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are provided in terminal evaluation are outcomes, sustainability, quality of monitoring and evaluation, quality of implementation, and quality of execution.

### **Outcome Ratings**

The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance of the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings
Satisfactory (S)	Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings
Unsatisfactory (U)	Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements

### **Sustainability Ratings**

The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale.

Likely (L)	There is little or no risks to sustainability
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainability
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainability
Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainability
Unable to Assess (UA)	Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability



### Monitoring and Evaluation Ratings

Quality of project M&E are assessed in terms of design and implementation on a six point scale:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations
Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation more or less meets expectations
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation somewhat lower than expected
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	There were severe short comings in M&E design/ implementation
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design / implementation

### Implementation and Execution Rating

Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the GEF Agencies that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the GEF Agencies and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations
Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor short comings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some short comings and quality of implementation / execution more or less meets expectations
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution somewhat lower than expected
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major short comings and quality of implementation / execution substantially lower than expected
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	There were severe short comings in quality of implementation / execution
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution

## Annex 6: Evaluation Report Outline

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Introduction
  - Purpose and objective of the TE
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Data Collection & Analysis
  - Ethics
  - Limitations
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Expected results
  - Main stakeholders
  - Theory of Change
3. Findings
 

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - National priorities and country driven-ness
  - Theory of Change
  - Gender equality and women's empowerment
  - Social and Environmental Safeguards
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

### 3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E(\*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)

### 3.3 Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

## 4. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations, Lessons Learned

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned

## 5. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding annexes)
- TE Mission Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits

- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail
- Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

## **Annex 7: List of Documents Consulted**

1. NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan, Project Document, UNDP/GEF (2014)
2. NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan, UNDP/ANME, (2015)
3. NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan, MTR Report, UNDP (2018)
4. Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs), UNDP/GEF (2016-2020)
5. GEF Evaluation Policy, GEF IEO, 2019
6. UNDP Revised Evaluation Policy, UNDP, 2019
7. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects, GEF, 2017
8. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP, 2019
9. Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, UNDP IEO, 2020
10. Outcome-Level Evaluations, A Companion Guide, UNDP, 2011
11. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, OECD, 2010
12. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations, UNEG, 2008

## Annex 8: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

#### Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Name of Consultant:** Dalibor Kysela

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant):                     N.A.                    

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at Vienna            30 July 2021

Signature:                     