

TERMINAL 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

Project Title:	NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan			
GEF Project ID:	5340		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	5182	GEF financing:	3,522,968	3,552,968
Country:	TUNISIA	IA/EA own:	600,00	
Region:	Arab States	Government:	14,806,640	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	49,976,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CCM Objective 3 (GEF-5)	Total co-financing:	65,382,640	
Executing Agency:	National Agency for Energy Conservation of Tunisia (Agence Nationale pour la Maitrise de l'énergie ANME)	Total Project Cost:	68,935,608	
Other Partners involved:	NA	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		6 January 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 6 January 2021	Actual: 6 January 2021

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 component:

- 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 CO₂e between 2016 and end-2019.

The Project is being implemented by UNDP Tunisia and the executing agency is ANME. The day-to-day management of the Project is being carried out by a project management unit consisting of one full-time project manager and one full-time project assistant. The PMU is located in the premises of ANME. 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 05 of January 2021

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 hard. weakened by years of transition not yet completed. 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 slow 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 impacted directly 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 process launched during this Covid 19 periods has 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 a lots consultancy bureau 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, 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, in that conditions of implementation of the project consultation and exchange for the validation of the results was done when it possible remotely through e-mails and Zoom/Skype meetings. However, it's important to point the lack of means of communication such as laptops and internet connections for the partners.

In addition, The NAMA TSP was adapted to the pandemic context so that he 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 report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE report will also assess the achievement of project results in relation the assessing the impact of covid-19 on the energy system in Tunisia. The objective of this mission is to 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 method¹ 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 (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.

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 the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- The Project Board 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

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

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 the November 2020, travel to the country is limited, and travel within the country are 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, to be taken into account availability, capacity or willingness of stakeholders to be interviewed remotely. In addition, access to the Internet or a computer can be a problem because many governmental and national parties can 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.

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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<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	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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\$)		Other Partners (mill. US\$)		Total (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	

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.²

² 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](#)

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, 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 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 30 working days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	02 days	15 march 2021
Evaluation Mission	15 days	31 march 2021
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	12 April 2021
Final Report	3 days	16 April 2021

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
TE Inception Report	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
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission	TE team presents to UNDP CO and project management
Draft TE Report	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
Final TE Report + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit Trail that details how all received comments have (or have not) been addressed in the final report.	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	TE team submits both documents to the UNDP CO.

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 evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document) and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

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

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN 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.
- 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.;
- Fluency in written and spoken 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 [UNEP '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)

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)³ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)⁴);
- 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 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

³<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL/RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD: <u>Outcome 3</u>: 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; <u>Outcome 4</u>: By 2019, regional stakeholders generate efficiently and use optimally, sustainably and inclusively the resources in regions.</p>					
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: 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</p>					
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Sustainable Development</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Focal Area Objective: GEF-5 FA Objective: #3 (CCM-3): “Promote Investment in Renewable Energy Technologies”</p>					
Objective/ Outcomes	Indicators	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective: To transform Tunisia’s energy sector for achieving large-scale emission reductions through the deployment of a TSP NAMA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total direct emission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project reports (Quarterly, Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) - Minutes of PSC - UNFCCC NAMA Registry - Energy sector GHG inventory report (First BUR and National Inventory Reports) - MRV mechanism or technology-specific MRV mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Government of Tunisia maintains its commitment to its voluntary GHG abatement initiatives through NAMAs, especially in the energy sector - Detailed sectoral inventory is established and operational in collaboration with GIZ - MRV mechanism(s)

		for desert conditions; weak interface between RE plants and the national grid)	reductions of 218,900 tonnes CO _{2e} between 2016 and 2019		developed in collaboration with the PMR initiative
					- Implementation barriers (regulatory, financial, technical, technological) have been reduced or overcome

<p>Outcome 1: 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 and implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project reports (Quarterly, Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) - Reports on SDM for energy sector - DREI reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Government of Tunisia maintains its commitment to its 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>Outcome 2: 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of national guidelines - Number of technical codes - Number of regulations - Number of financial instruments to capitalise the Energy Transition Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report on standardised 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 operationalisation of the environmental and social safeguard guidelines - Lessons-learned report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 operationalisation 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>sources of capitalisation not sufficient to support the implementation of the TSP NAMA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- No social and environmental safeguards are required under current legislation for projects with installed capacity below 300 MW			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<p>Outcome 3: The TSP is operationalised by demonstrating a proof-of-concept energy NAMA with quantified GHG emission reductions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emission reductions from grid-connected wind and PV power - Number of households benefiting from electricity generated by wind and PV plants (households/year) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline projects implemented with identified deficiencies - No MRV protocol / system for TSP NAMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8,954 tCO_{2e}/year from 10 MW PV plant at Tozeur (35,815 tCO_{2e} between 2016 and 2019) - 45,775 tCO_{2e}/year from 24 MW PV plant at Gabes (183,100 tCO_{2e} between 2016 and 2019) <p>Number of households benefiting from renewable energy by end of project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11,544 from PV; - 50,016 from wind 	<p>Project reports (Annual, PIR, MTE, TE) and minutes of PSC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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
---	---	---	---	--	--

ANNEX B: PROJECT INFORMATION PACKAGE TO BE REVIEWED BY THE TE TEAM

1. PIF
2. UNDP INITIATION PLAN
3. UNDP PROJECT DOCUMENT
4. UNDP ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SCREENING RESULTS
5. PROJECT INCEPTION REPORT
6. ALL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS (PIR'S)
7. MTR REPORT
8. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORTS AND WORK PLANS OF THE VARIOUS IMPLEMENTATION TASK TEAMS
9. FINALIZED GEF CCM TRACKING TOOL AT CEO ENDORSEMENT AND MIDTERM
10. OVERSIGHT MISSION REPORTS
11. ALL MONITORING REPORTS PREPARED BY THE PROJECT
12. FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINES USED BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT
13. REPORTS OF VARIOUS STUDIES ELABORATED IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PROJECT

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the NAMA Support for the TSP Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ANNEX C: EVALUATION CRITERIA MATRIX

(sample questions to be filled in by the Commissioning Unit prior to advertising the TOR; the TE team will finalize the matrix when they are recruited)

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"> o what extent has the project remained relevant to national priorities ? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does UNDP's engagement reflect strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in a development context and its comparative advantage? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the theory of change presented in the results model provide a relevant and appropriate vision that can serve as a basis for other initiatives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has gender been taken into account and integrated from the design, taking into account the specificities of the country? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the expected results of the project been achieved or progress made towards the achievement of the desired outcomes? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the results taken into account gender equity? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How have the outputs delivered by UNDP impacted the outcomes and how have they been shown to be effective? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the outputs of the project resulted from the rational use of resources? To what extent were qualitative products delivered on time? 	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the partnership arrangements been conducive to delivering the outputs? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the monitoring and assurance mechanisms provided managers with a flow of data that can inform their decision making so that they can adjust implementation accordingly? 	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has a sustainability strategy, particularly in terms of capacity building of the main national actors, been developed or implemented? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What makes it possible to demonstrate the sustainability of the results obtained, 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do the mechanisms and policies put in place make it possible to sustain the results? 	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the impact of the project on gender: negative, positive or neutral both in terms of implementation, results and effects, also on the final beneficiaries, and suggest areas for improvement for future projects 	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: TE RATING SCALES

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations.
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation more or less meets expectations.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation somewhat lower than expected.
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected.
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	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.

Oversight/Implementation and Execution Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations.
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor short comings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations.
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some short comings and quality of implementation / execution more or less meets expectations.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution somewhat lower than expected.
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major short comings and quality of implementation / execution substantially lower than expected.
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	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 oversight/implementation and execution.

Outcome Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings
5 = Satisfactory (S)	Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings.
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings.
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Only negligible 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 Scale

Ratings	Description
4 = Likely (L)	There is little or are no risks to sustainability.
3 = Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainability
2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainability.
1 = Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainability.
Unable to Assess (UA)	Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

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.
8. Evaluators must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE time frame and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - TE 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 Manual⁷)
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 rated⁸)
- 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

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ 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.

- 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 and implementation (*)
 - UNDP oversight/implementation (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*), and overall Outcome (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming & Cross-cutting Issues, including Gender
 - Sustainability (*): financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Gender & vulnerabilities
 - 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 G: TE REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be signed by CO and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and included in the final document)

Terminal Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office (M&E Focal Point)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
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: TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. International Terminal Project Evaluator (Team Leader)

1) Assignment Information

Assignment Title:	International Terminal Project Evaluator
UNDP Practice Area:	Environment/Climate Change Adaptation
Post Level:	International candidates
Cluster/Project:	Environment and Climate Change Cluster /NAMA support for Tunisian Solar Plan Project

2) Objective and Scope of Work

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. The Terminal Evaluation 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. 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.

Detail on the methodology and approach of the evaluation is attached in the Annex to these terms of reference.

3) Expected Deliverables

Deliverables	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
Inception Report which details the methodology and approach of the Terminal Evaluation process	02 days	15 March 2021	TE team submits Inception Report to UNDP CO and project management
Presentation of the initial findings of the evaluation	15 days	31 March 2021	TE team presents to UNDP CO and project management
Draft final report	10 days	12 April 2021	TE team submits draft to UNDP CO; draft is reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
Final Terminal Evaluation Report	3 days	16 April 2021	TE team submits both documents to the UNDP CO.

4) Institutional Arrangement

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.

5) Duration of the Work

30 working days from 13 March 2021 to 16 April 2021.

6) Duty Station

Since the November 2020, travel to the country is limited, and travel within the country are 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, to be taken into account availability, capacity or willingness of stakeholders to be interviewed remotely. In addition, access to the Internet or a computer can be a problem because many governmental and national parties can 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.

7) Minimum Qualifications

Education:	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.;
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimum 10 years of result-based project management, monitoring and evaluation of environmental related projects• Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage• Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors• Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): climate change mitigation and/or energy efficiency / renewable energies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience working with government, particularly with projects under National Implementation is an asset.
Competencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarity with government planning systems and institutional roles • Ability to interact with senior government officials • Team leadership experience • Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
Language Requirements:	Full proficiency in English (written and spoken).

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors
- Development Agencies or major donors

8) Criteria for Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Relevant Educational background	10
Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors	30
Minimum 10 years of result-based project management, monitoring and evaluation of environmental related projects	30
Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): in the targeted focal area(s): climate change mitigation and/or energy efficiency / renewable energies	30
Total Obtainable Score	100