

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support 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 project “Addressing climate change vulnerabilities and risks in vulnerable coastal areas of Tunisia” (PIMS 4697).

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Addressing climate change vulnerabilities and risks in vulnerable coastal areas of Tunisia			
GEF Project ID:	00089624		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	4697	GEF financing:	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 5,500,000
Country:	Tunisia	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Bizerte, Ariana, Medenine	Government:		
Focal Area:	Northwest coast of the Gulf of Tunis and the Island of Djerba	Other:	UNDP 100,000 GEI 30,000	UNDP 114,318 GEI 30,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	130,000	144,318
Executing Agency:	Coastal Protection and Planning Agency	Total Project Cost:	\$ 5 630,000	\$ 5 644, 318
Other Partners involved:	NGOs Municipalities	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		23/12/2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 24/12/2019	Actual: 24/12/2020

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: designed to support the Government of Tunisia in the design and implementation of baseline coastal adaptation measures on the ground in the northwest coast of the Gulf of Tunis and the Island of Djerba by strengthening APAL’s capacity to consider a whole approach system for coastal management for medium and long -term impacts of climate change as well as vulnerabilities across key sectors (tourism, agriculture, fisheries, water). and to facilitate the implementation of appropriate soft solutions in other interventions by giving APAL the expertise to exploit existing coastal monitoring data, consider climate change scenarios, generate risk- based assessments and recommend appropriate soft protection measures and monitoring schemes).

This project proposes a risk-based approach to Climate Change Adaptation by enabling flexible adaptation pathways, which will build resilience to climate change and provide maximum co-benefits. As tourism is a dominate source of revenue for the region, a set of economic instruments will be devised to signal the existing risks and drive future hotel and private residence development, including investments, away from vulnerable areas. With such an

approach, local development plans will be made more risk-based and climate compatible. Both the public and private sectors will serve as important catalysts for adaptation interventions and in supporting coastal monitoring.

Currently, the institutional framework for coastal management in Tunisia does not take into account the projections of climate change scenarios. Coastal protection interventions are usually reactive with a preference for hard engineering that integrates the risks of climate change only in a very limited way.

The costs and benefits of the adaptation of Tunisian coastal zones to climate change are poorly assessed and not considered in most of the current investment policies. Tunisia has insufficient resources to conduct adaptation projects that can bring benefits to the various business sectors settled on the coast and reduce simultaneously the risks associated with climate change. All these findings compromise the sustainable development in the coastal zone at the moment.

In response, the present project proposes an approach, allowing to integrate at the level of the programs and the strategies of development the consideration of the risk of climate change. The public and private sectors will be important catalysts for the interventions of adaptation and monitoring of the coastal zone.

The project support Tunisia to promote strategies, technologies and innovative financing options to address the risks of climate change and its impacts on the populations and the main socioeconomic sectors of the most vulnerable coastal zones.

The project proposes:

- The update of the regulatory and legislative frameworks to reduce the impacts of the effects of the CC on the coastal development and making the existing infrastructure more resilient. A particular attention will be granted to the creation of an environment conducive for the Integrated Coastal Zone Management which takes into account risks of climate change;
- The application of flexible and innovative measures of reduction of the risks linked to climate change such as protective measures (for example, restoration of dunes and wet zones) and best practices for the management of the water (for example, the controlled extraction of groundwater reserves to prevent intrusion of salt water) in line with the Integrated Coastal Zone Management;
- The provision of a better climate information for monitoring coastal hazards, early warning system and planning climate-resilient development;
- The mobilization of public and private funds for coastal adaptation projects in national and local level by making projects more bankable;
- The introduction of methods of risk transfer from the public and private sectors to ensure resilient management practices for long-term climate change in coastal areas.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has 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 (*fill in [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. The evaluation should also have a gender lens and assess whether the project has had a negative, positive or neutral impact in terms of implementation, results and effects, including on the final beneficiaries, and propose areas for improvement for future projects.

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 (Ministry of the Environment, Coastal Protection and Planning Agency (APAL), Land-Use and Planning Department (DGAT), The Department of water resources (DGRE) at the Ministry of Agriculture (DGRE), Municipalities, ..), in particular the GEF operational focal point, as well as UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Tunisia, including the following project sites (Ghar El Melh-Sidi Ali Mekki- Kalaât Landlous and Djerba). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), members of the Project Management Unit (PMU), officials from executing agencies and private sector investors, key experts and consultants in the subject areas and CSOs, etc.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area 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. All of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability should include gender lens.

Due to the pandemic situation and possible evolution, the consultant is asked to propose digital alternatives and solutions to hold the evaluation, as a part of its methodology.

## 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](#).

<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	

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

3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
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 (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluator 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>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific,

<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](#)

relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Tunisia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 24 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	2 days	11 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	10 days	05 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	10 days	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
<b>Final Report</b>	2days	26 <sup>th</sup> November 2020

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and detailed methodology	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## 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 evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Post graduate degree (minimum master’s degree or equivalent) in studies engineering, environmental science or management, climate change, economics or other closely related field
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Fluent French in speaking and reading.

**EVALUATION METHOD:**

(See [Annex I](#))

**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'](#)

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

*(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

%	Milestone
10%	Following the approval of proposed methodology
60%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
30%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%<sup>3</sup>:

- 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).

<sup>3</sup> The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

[https://poppp.undp.org/\\_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://poppp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)

- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>4</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form)**<sup>5</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 indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Addressing climate change vulnerabilities and risks in vulnerable coastal areas of Tunisia*” by email at the following address ONLY: [procurement.tn@undp.org](mailto:procurement.tn@undp.org) by *31h of August at 4 pm Tunis local time*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

---

<sup>4</sup><https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

**This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  
 UNDAF/CPD Outcome # 4: By 2019, regional actors will manage efficiently, optimally, sustainably and inclusively the use of regional resources.

CPD output: 4.4. The frameworks and systems for improved disaster risk prevention and management are developed to enhance the resilience of communities and ecosystems.

CPAP output 4.4.1: Participatory governance, which promotes prevention, preparedness and response to disasters and to the effects of climate change, is promoted.

### Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

Number of regional development plans elaborated which integrate land use specifications and environmental aspects

### Primary Applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):

1.4.1 Number of countries with systems in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify use of climate finance

1.4.2 Number of countries with comprehensive measures – plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets – implemented to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives

### Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:

Objective 2: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level

### Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:

Outcome 2.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas

Outcome 2.2: Increased adaptive capacity to climate change in development sectors

Outcome 3.1: Innovative and sustainable economic instruments established to accelerate country-wide adoption and up scaling of proven coastal adaptation measures

### Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:

- Number and type of development frameworks that include adaptation measures
- Number and type of natural resource assets created, maintained or improved to withstand conditions from climate variability and change
- Number and type of development frameworks and sectorial strategies that include specific budgets for adaptation actions

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective</b>				

**To promote innovative adaptation strategies, technologies and financing options to address the additional risks posed by climate change on populations and key socio-economic sectors in Tunisia’s most vulnerable coastal areas**

<p>1.Amount of public funds mobilised to support coastal adaptation</p>	<p>Tunisia’s 2008 SNC coastal study indicated that the economic impact of climate change related SLR on agriculture and tourism is expected to cost 0.63% of the GDP/year, or approximately US\$1 billion. The current national coastal protection budget is limited at 10.4 m USD. This budget is being used to support site-specific projects, using predominantly hard engineering interventions, to reduce coastal erosion. Current interventions do not consider the use of an integrated approach to adapt to climate change (e.g., holistic watershed thinking or a Whole of Systems approach).</p> <p>1. BASELINE: Limited domestic financing mechanisms for coastal adaptation exist and no financing exists on</p>	<p>1.TARGET: By the end of the project, a disbursement of at least 10 m USD is accrued from public sources and earmarked for coastal adaptation</p>	<p>1. Government budget lines committed to coastal adaptation</p>	<p>ASSUMPTION: The Government of Tunisia has enough incentive to mobilise funds which can be effectively targeted towards coastal adaptation activities in a transparent manner with appropriate financial management</p> <p>ASSUMPTION: There is sufficient technical capacity within APAL for successful execution and implementation of the project</p>
---	--	---	---	--

	<p>regional and local levels</p> <p>Furthermore, the issues of coastal erosion, submersion, salinization and flooding are exacerbated by a limited number of applied coastal adaptation responses which take into account the long-term implications of CC. Diversified, locally sourced and environmentally-friendly coastal protection technologies are required.</p>			<p>RISK; Water and coastal management strategies are made ineffective by an unanticipated increase in the frequency of flood events and drought which jeopardizes coastal protection and water conservation measures</p>
<p>2.Djerba: Percentage of coastal hotels working in cooperation with local municipalities to implement locally sourced, naturally available soft protection measures (e.g., sea grass and sand layering)</p>	<p>2. BASELINE: Only four hotels are employing soft protection measures to support coastal erosion (ganivelles and geotubes). However, such soft interventions are being made ad-hoc without an idea of upstream hydrological, ecological and geomorphological processes.</p>	<p>2. TARGET 50 coastal hotels in the targeted areas implementing soft protection measures in alignment with recommended adaptation options outlined in Djerba’s risk-based spatial management plan (Component 1)</p>	<p>2.APAL monitoring logs of soft, coastal adaptation measures in Djerba</p>	<p>RISK; Water and coastal management strategies are made ineffective by an unanticipated increase in the frequency of flood events and drought which jeopardizes coastal protection and water conservation measures</p> <p>RISK: Insufficient institutional engagement and coordination may prevent successful project delivery in the current transitional context in Tunisia</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1</b></p>				

<b>Institutional capacity to plan for and respond to increasing climate change risks in coastal areas is improved</b>				
<p>1. Number and type of policy or legal frameworks informed by coastal dynamic modelling and adopted to account for coastal risks</p>	<p>1. BASELINE Currently, in Tunisia there have been no concrete steps taken to incorporate climate change (CC) risks into policy and legal frameworks governing coastal management. Spatial planning regulations, building codes and Environmental Impact Assessments do not consider anticipated impacts of CC and erosion and flooding risks on the built environment, especially in tourism districts. Current rules for setbacks for coastal development are not based on site-specific assessments and do not consider well-established risk (e.g., Sea Level Rise, SLR).</p>	<p>1. TARGET: at least three pieces of regulation governing coastal management (such as, the Maritime Public Domain (DPM), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIE), the Code of Planning and Urban Development (CATU) and the new Environment Code) updated to consider SLR, erosion and coastal flooding in their policies / legal frameworks</p>	<p>1. Review of the DPM, EIE, Code d'Environnement and the Code de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Urbanisme (CATU)</p>	<p>ASSUMPTION: Institutions have the will and ability to engage in long-term planning to mitigate potential coastal risks</p> <p>ASSUMPTION: Relevant Ministries have a vested interest to fully integrate coastal adaptation strategies into their long-term planning</p>
<p>2. Creation of a national ICZM inter-ministerial platform to facilitate the coastal adaptation</p>	<p>2. BASELINE Although Tunisia ratified the Barcelona Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) protocol, implementation of the ICZM in terms of actions has been slow. Currently, the</p>	<p>2. TARGET: Creation of a national ICZM inter-ministerial platform to coordinate projects, strategies and programmes involving the coastal zone on</p>	<p>2. Review on the coordination of agencies conducting ICZM projects/programme</p>	

	<p>regional MedPartnership programme is trying to integrate CC into national strategies to begin implementation of ICZM in Tunisia. However, there have been no on-the-ground implementations of ICZM. The Ministries are also not collaborating with the National Shore Protection and Planning Agency (APAL) when they are implementing coastal development activities. Tunisia therefore lacks a mechanism to coordinate projects, strategies and programmes involving the coastal zone on the national and regional levels. (Other regional level ICZM initiatives in the Mediterranean include the Global Water Partnership, PEGASO and UNESO-IHP.)</p>	<p>the national and regional levels and to facilitate decision-making on sustainable and climate resilient coastal development</p>		
<p>3. Number of risk-based spatial management plans used by the Municipalities of Houmet Essouk in Djerba and Sidi Ali Mekki in the</p>	<p>3. BASELINE Through the local Agenda 21 approach already applied in Tunisia, community informed sustainable planning is possible. However, a renewed</p>	<p>3. TARGET: 1 risk-based spatial management plan developed for the Municipalities of Houmet Essouk in Djerba and Sidi Ali Mekki in the</p>	<p>3. Land management plan updates (Local Agenda 21) for the municipalities of Houmet Essouk in Djerba and Sidi Ali Mekki in the northwest of the Gulf of Tunis</p>	

northwest of the Gulf of Tunis	local Agenda 21 which considers up to date coastal risks (erosion, SLR, flooding) is lacking in both sites of the project. Stakeholders have not been consulted about the current potential coastal risks in their region because there is no available risk planning tool to facilitate the application of options for ICZM and to develop site specific design criteria for sustainable development including appropriate adaptation strategies and flexible pathways.	northwest of the Gulf of Tunis detailing prioritized, cost-effective ICZM and adaptation strategies / flexible pathways, targeting the agricultural sector (northwest coast of the Gulf of Tunis site) and the tourism sector (Djerba)		
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--

**Outcome 2**  
**Climate change resilience of priority coastal areas enhanced through implementation and dissemination of innovative risk reduction measures covering 22 km of coast and 670 hectares of wetland and benefiting 150,000 inhabitants**

1. Number of soft adaptation measures implemented which improve coastal conditions by increasing resilience to absorb change as measured by the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length of coast preserving public</li> </ul>	1. BASELINE: Existing baseline actions and projects, such as under APAL's National Coastal Erosion Protection Programme, the ICZM project, and the KFW project consist mainly of reactive, end-of-pipeline solutions such as artificial	1. TARGET: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Djerba: Length preserving 10 km of coast public open space and natural ecosystems</li> <li>Both sites: 670 hectares of wetlands with improved</li> </ul>	1. Design and construction logs housed at APAL;  National Tourism Board and Ministry of Agriculture records on the use of recycled water in hotels and on agricultural land in Djerba and in the	ASSUMPTION: Initial coastal vulnerability studies and technical assessments are accurate in their predictions of coastal impacts  RISK: Works associated with coastal protection lead to unanticipated
---	---	---	--	--

<p>open space and natural ecosystems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area of wetlands with improved ecological conditions</li> <li>• Length of coast with stable dune fixation</li> <li>• Number of kilometers of living shorelines implemented</li> <li>• Percentage increase in hotels and agricultural land which use recycled water</li> </ul>	<p>sand nourishment and 'hard' protection measures (e.g., shore embankment, breakwater construction). Although the MedWetCoast project offered encouraging sand dune rehabilitation results, rehabilitation solutions are not cost-effective because required materials must be imported. Similarly, APAL's experience with the installation of geotextile tubes in the El Mezraya zone indicated that materials are too fragile.</p> <p>Presently, 5 soft coastal protection and water management measures have been implemented in Djerba Ganivelles, dune stabilisation with native grasses, geotextile tubes, wind-breaking fences, water recycling and purification practices in some hotels)</p>	<p>ecological conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sites: 20 Km of successful dune fixation</li> <li>• Ghar El Melh: 2 kilometres of living shorelines implemented</li> <li>• 5% increase in hotels and agricultural land which use recycled water</li> </ul>	<p>Northwest of the Gulf of Tunis</p>	<p>environmental impacts (e.g., eutrophication)</p>
---	--	---	---------------------------------------	---

<p>2. Establishment of a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) database with qualitative and quantitative indicators of soft coastal adaptation measures which contributes to the central coastal databank (SIAD)</p>	<p>2. BASELINE: No M&amp;E system exists for adaptive coastal management: In spite of 13 years' experience with coastal preservation projects, the National Shore Protection and Planning Agency (APAL) lacks technical and operational capacity to measure adaptation in accordance with ICZM. Coastal developments have been evaluated based on photographs and not any quantifiable indicators that dictate long-term success. Also, APAL's developments themselves have been along limited reaches of coast, not accounting for interactions with the surrounding watershed and ecosystems.</p>	<p>2. TARGET: Establishment of a M&amp;E database with qualitative and quantitative indicators of soft coastal adaptation measures which contributes to the central coastal databank (SIAD)</p>	<p>2. Observation/monitoring logs  Annual M&amp;E surveys;  Project mid-term and terminal evaluations.</p>	
<p>3. Number of tide gauges and buoys installed to support coastal risk monitoring</p>	<p>3. In response to direct and indirect impacts from extreme weather conditions, the government has put an early warning system high on its agenda. Along the coast, alerts are</p>	<p>3. TARGET: Three (3) tide gauge and 1 buoy to be procured and installed.</p>	<p>3. Review of APAL's procurements for coastal monitoring</p>	

	<p>planned to be used for seismic disturbances (tsunamis), flooding, coastal surges, strong winds and marrobbios . As a first step towards improved observation and forecasting capacity, the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment with support from the GIZ Climate Change Assistance Programme, developed a concept plan for a national climate change multi-hazard monitoring and early warning system. Some initiatives such as the Environment Energy Programme (PEE) and the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) (described in Section A.7) have provided coastal monitoring equipment to support alert generation. In spite of some point locations for observation and monitoring, the alerts and products from the regional center are not downscaled to suit Tunisia and updated</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>by Tunisia specific observations.</p> <p>3. BASELINE:</p> <p>4 buoys and 2 tide gauges procured and installed through the AAP project. 4 buoys procured and installed through the PEE project.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

**Outcome 3**

**Innovative and sustainable economic instruments established to accelerate country-wide adoption and up scaling of proven coastal adaptation measures**

<p>1. Publication of long-term financing strategies to guide APAL in how to mobilize funds for coastal adaptation</p>	<p>Tunisia's 2008 SNC Coastal study indicated that the total cost of adapting to a 0.5-meter SLR is approximately US\$1 billion. The Government of Tunisia currently has no financial mechanisms to cover the costs of SLR and erosion. Moreover, due to the difficulty in demonstrating cost-effective climate compatible measures to reduce water stress and impacts on coastal settlements, the Government does not have the knowledge on how to properly attract public and private financial</p>	<p>1.TARGET</p> <p>Publication of at least 1 long-term financing strategy to guide APAL in how to mobilize funds for coastal adaptation</p>	<p>1.Financing plan at the ministry level (Ministry of Equipment, Land Planning and Sustainable Development) earmarked for coastal adaptation</p>	<p>ASSUMPTION: Institutions working in coastal adaptation have sufficient capacity and incentive to mobilise and manage funds and new economic instruments for coastal adaptation</p> <p>RISK: Insurance companies are not willing and incentivized to study the feasibility of adapting disaster risk insurance</p> <p>RISK: NGOs/CSOs do not have sufficient financial literacy to manage small revolving fund or micro-grants for small-scale coastal adaptation projects</p>
---	---	---	---	--

	<p>mechanisms to support long-term coastal needs.</p> <p>1. BASELINE: No strategies which provide guidance on how to mobilise funds for coastal adaptation</p>			
<p>2. Percentage of APAL's budget provided to community members (including NGOs/CSOs) so that they can finance community-based coastal adaptation measures</p>	<p>2. BASELINE: Community-run coastal adaptation projects (with the support of local NGOs/CSOs) have had much success in Tunisia. During the Africa Adaptation Project (AAP) 7 NGOs developed Adaptation Action Plans with the goal of promoting climate change awareness. In spite of the solid collaboration between APAL and NGOs/CSOs, investment mechanisms to support community-based adaptation are limited in Tunisia. Consequently, there are no financial mechanisms to support sustainability of coastal adaptation activities in the long-term. NGO/CSO</p>	<p>2. TARGET 2% of APAL's budget supports community members or members of NGOs/CSOs to implement small adaptation projects (e.g., nursery development, sand dune fixation, etc.)</p>	<p>2. Funds available to NGOs/CSOs for coastal adaptation</p>	

	engagement in coastal rehabilitation is hindered by their lack of financial resources.			
--	--	--	--	--

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR**

- PIF
- UNDP INITIATION PLAN
- UNDP PROJECT DOCUMENT
- UNDP ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SCREENING RESULTS
- PROJECT INCEPTION REPORT
- ALL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS (PIR'S)
- MTR REPORT
- QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORTS AND WORK PLANS OF THE VARIOUS IMPLEMENTATION TASK TEAMS
- AUDIT REPORTS
- FINALIZED GEF CCM TRACKING TOOL AT CEO ENDORSEMENT AND MIDTERM
- OVERSIGHT MISSION REPORTS
- ALL MONITORING REPORTS PREPARED BY THE PROJECT
- FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINES USED BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT
- REPORTS OF VARIOUS STUDIES ELABORATED IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PROJECT

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS WILL ALSO BE AVAILABLE:

- PROJECT OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES, MANUALS AND SYSTEMS
- UNDP COUNTRY/COUNTRIES PROGRAMME DOCUMENT(S) MINUTES OF THE ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITIES AND RISKS IN VULNERABLE COASTAL AREAS OF TUNISIA BOARD MEETINGS AND OTHER MEETINGS (I.E. PROJECT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS)

## **ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings          5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings          4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)          3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings          2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems          1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability          3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks          2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks          1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)          1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)          2. Minimal (M)          1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>          Not Applicable (N/A)          Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

---

### 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.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>6</sup>

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>6</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>7</sup>

---

- 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  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>8</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>9</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - 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)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

---

<sup>7</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>8</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>9</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool (if applicable)

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP PIMS #)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and by comment number ("#" column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	Evaluator response and actions taken

## ANNEX I : EVALUATION METHOD

The offers of individual consultants will be evaluated based on the combined scoring method:

- ✓ Technical qualifications (100 points max.) weight: 70%
- ✓ Financial bid (100 points max.) weight: 30%

A two-stage procedure will be utilised in evaluating the offers, with evaluation of the technical qualifications being completed prior to any financial bid being compared. Only the financial bids of the offerors who passed the minimum technical qualifications score of 70 points will be evaluated.

### a) Criteria for evaluation of technical qualifications score:

#	Technical evaluation criterion	Highest possible technical qualifications score
1	<p>Post graduate degree in studies engineering, environmental science or management, climate change, economics or other closely related field</p> <p>Master's degree (minimum required): 10 points PhD: 15 points</p>	15 points
2	<p>Relevant work experience in the areas related to climate change and Integrated Coastal Zone Management s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 years (minimum required): 10 points</li> <li>- More than 10 years 15 points</li> </ul>	15 points
3	<p>Relevant experience in projects evaluation/review based on result-based management evaluation methodologies and/or applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 projects (minimum required): 15 points</li> <li>- 3 projects: 20 points</li> <li>- 4 projects and more: 25 points</li> </ul> <p>If the relevant experience (associated to criterion 2) does not exceed 2 projects and only in the case where at least one of these projects was conducted within United Nations system, additional 10 points will be added to the score related to this criterion.</p>	25 points
4	<p>Relevant experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations:</p>	20 points

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 specific experience (minimum required): 15 points</li> <li>- 2 specific experiences and more: 20 points</li> </ul>	
5	Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal	25 points
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100 points</b>

Only the offerors who have attained a minimum technical qualification score of 70 points will be considered as technical qualified offerors.

**b) Financial bid score:**

- Only the offers which attained a minimum technical qualification score of 70 points will be qualified for financial bid comparison.
- Among these qualified offers, the score of 100 points will be attributed to the offer with lowest financial bid. The score of any other qualified offer is calculated using the following formula:  
Financial bid score of the offer = (lowest financial bid / financial bid of the offer) \* 100

**c) Selection method and award criteria**

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and;
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical qualifications and financial bid specific to the solicitation. The total score for each offeror will be calculated using the following formula: Total score = Technical qualifications score\*70% + Financial bid score\*30%