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## I. Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>RENFORCEMENT DU CENTRE NATIONAL DE PRODUCTION PROPRE EN TUNISIE - PREMIERE ET DEUXIEME PARTIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO project No. (SAP ID)</td>
<td>104107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>African Arab States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal area(s) and operational programme</td>
<td>Energy and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing agency</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project executing partners</td>
<td>Ministere de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable (MEDD), Ministere de l'Industrie, de l'Energie et des petites et Moyennes Entreprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation start date (PAD issuance date)</td>
<td>04 January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)</td>
<td>31 December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised expected implementation end date (if any)</td>
<td>30 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual implementation end date</td>
<td>31 December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost (EUR)</td>
<td>PPPT: Phase 1: EUR 981,405 Phase 2: EUR 1,543,002 Réseau Arabe (KMS): Phase 1: EUR 331,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term review date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned terminal evaluation date</td>
<td>June/July 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Project document)
2. Background

The project Renforcement du Centre National de Production Propre en Tunisie – Premiere Partie - (UNIDO project numbers UE/TUN/09/001 (PA), UE/TUN/09/004-005 (SAP ID 104107), a joint project of the UNIDO and UNEP on resource efficiency and cleaner production (RECP), co-financed by the Swiss Secretariat of Economic Affairs (SECO), has the objective to:

- Create national competencies in Cleaner Production (CP)
- Encourage dialogue between industry and government
- Promote investment for the transfer and development of clean technologies

With this programme, UNIDO aims to narrow the gap between competitive industrial production and environmental concerns. The CP is more than just a technical solution. It is used in all levels in decision-making in the industry with the main objective of adoption of clean technologies and techniques in the industrial sector. The RECP program uses an innovative approach. It increases the competitiveness, facilitates access to markets and strengthens the productive capacities of developing countries (and in-transition), while considering the other two dimensions of sustainable development, namely, protection of the environment and social development. UNIDO began, in 1994, to establish the National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs). Since then, 43 NCPCs and Cleaner Production (CP) Programmes have been implemented.

In January 2008, UNIDO launched the second phase of an Integrated Programme for Technical Cooperation with Tunisia, in cooperation with the Ministry of Industry, Energy and Small and Medium Enterprises. The establishment of a NCPC is entailed in its scope, for strengthening national capacities in matters of CP and networking with counterparts in the region.

Tunisia is located in Northern Africa between Algeria and Libya, bordering the Mediterranean Sea. Economic growth in Tunisia in 2012 was around 3.7%, fell to 2.6% in 2013, rose again slightly to 2.8% in 2014, is expected to maintain its recovery in 2015 and rise to over 3% from 2016. Its natural resources are petroleum, phosphates, iron ore, lead, zinc and salt. It faces environmental issues in ineffective toxic and hazardous waste disposal and posing health risks; water pollution from raw sewage; limited natural freshwater resources; deforestation; overgrazing; soil erosion; and desertification. Tunisia is a party to several international environmental agreements, such as, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Climate Change-Kyoto Protocol, Desertification, Endangered Species, Environmental Modification, Hazardous Wastes, Law of the Sea, Marine Dumping, Ozone Layer Protection, Ship Pollution, Wetlands.

Tunisia has a population of almost 11 million. Around 40% of the population is below the age of 25 and 44% between 25-54 years. It has a high rate of youth (15-24 years) unemployment of over 40% and an overall unemployment rate of 17%. Agriculture is a minor part of the GDP (8.6%); industry has a more significant share of 30.4% and the rest being contributed by services (61%). Industrial products are petroleum, mining (particularly phosphate, iron ore), tourism, textiles, footwear, agribusiness and beverages. Industrial production growth rate is estimated (2013) at around 3%.

The main economic partner of Tunisia is the European Union (EU) with 64.3% of total imports and 76.9% of total exports in 2006. In 2007, exports totaled USD 14.81 billion. Exported goods are: clothes, agricultural products, phosphate, oil and mechanical and electrical equipment. In 2006, the main trade partners of Tunisia were France (28.9%), Italy (20.4%), Germany (8.6%) and Spain (6.1%). Exports to these countries were supported by signing the Trade Association Agreement and Free Trade Agreement with the EU in 1995 and as a result of the creation of a free trade zone on January 1, 2008. Tunisia has also signed bilateral free trade agreements with Morocco, Jordan, Egypt and Turkey.

Tunisia is one of the main markets for Swiss companies in North Africa and the sixth largest market in Africa. Several bilateral agreements have been established: the Commercial Agreement (1961), Agreement on Technical and Scientific Cooperation (1972), Agreement on the Protection and Promotion of Investments Capital (1961), Agreement for avoidance of

Following the Agreement with the EFTA in 2004 as well as considering the acquired experiences and the evolving economic environment in Tunisia, the Tunisian and Swiss governments decided to clarify and strengthen the framework for their cooperation in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). One of the areas of cooperation of the 2004 MoU is the environment, for which Switzerland\(^1\) agrees to consider pursuing a technical cooperation bilaterally as well as multilaterally. Careful attention will be accorded to multilateral mechanisms for the protection of the environment and sustainable development. Another component of the 2004 MoU in relation to CP is to promote exports.

The value of manufacturing in producing industries rose in 2007 to 30.7 billion TND (Tunisian Dinar), from 19.6 billion TND in 2000, accounting for an average annual growth rate of 9%. The value added made up, in 2007, 23% of the value of manufacturing. Value added reached TND 7 billion in 2007. The industrial sector has experienced considerable development since the 70's. It has recorded a steady growth of about 6% per year since 1987. Its contribution to GDP progressed continuously: 7% in 1962, it passed 14.3% in 1980, reaching 18.1% in 1991 and over 20% in 2004.

Companies, whose size is greater than or equal to 10 employees, employ altogether 477,825 persons. Each year, the industry creates 30% of national employment. The value of exports of manufacturing industries rose from TND 6.885 billion in 2000 to TND 14.349 billion in 2007. The industrial fabric of Tunisia has 5702 companies of which 2670 are exporting (which employ more than or equal to 10 persons).

In Tunisia, the industry developed primarily to serve the domestic market in a protected environment. Since the early 1990s, the economic policies began to change and integrate the Tunisian economy in the world market. The gradual opening of the economy has begun to erode the performance of Tunisian industry. Especially, small and medium industries, often family-run, struggle to maintain their position in the national and international market. Further, pollution (water, air, soil) due to industries, increasing energy consumption and production of waste is also increasing. A 2005 study identifies 386 industrial pollution sources on a total of 756. They belong to different industries as follows:

- Food: 198
- Leather and Shoes: 8
- Rubber and plastic: 4
- Chemical industry: 54
- Construction materials, ceramics, glass: 49
- Mechanical and Metallurgical Industry: 53
- Textiles and Clothing: 18
- Electrical and Electronic Industry: 2

The active participation of Tunisia in the field of sustainable development has been demonstrated by several policy actions, the establishment of structures and promotion of tools within the national strategy for sustainable development. The implementation is based on four principles:

- Conservation of natural resources;

\(^1\) The Swiss Secretariat of Economic Affairs (SECO) is responsible for the Swiss technical cooperation. It is the Swiss federal government's centre of expertise for all core issues relating to economic policy. Its aim is to ensure sustainable economic growth by putting in place the necessary regulatory and economic policy conditions. Further, it also helps to ensure access to all markets for Swiss goods and services and investment. In the wake of the World Summit on Development and Environment in Rio in 1992, SECO has several instruments to realize commercial aspects of international environmental conventions, including the NCPCs, established in cooperation with UNIDO.
• Preservation of natural resources;
• Improvement of the quality of life of citizens;
• A balanced economic growth and sectoral development.


The annual report on the state of the environment, prepared by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) in 2005, stressed that the development of the industrial sector over the last 20 years has generated the following environmental expenses, which are indicated as priorities by the National government:

- Use in the industrial sector of 4% of the total national water resources, 50 million m3 of water per year;
- The use of 35% of the total energy consumption in the industrial sector;
- The generation of solid waste, including 150,000 tons of special waste.

The CP approach was introduced in Tunisian industries around 20 years ago by international development agencies such as UNIDO, UNEP, USAID, GTZ, the Italian Development Cooperation, and Swiss Development Cooperation. These pilot projects aimed to demonstrate the economic and environmental profits of CP and sustainability in the Tunisian industrial context.

3. Project objective:

The project contributes to the implementation of the joint program of UNIDO and UNEP on resource efficiency and cleaner production (RECP) with the following components:

- **Component 1**: Capacity building in RECP services, as well as other assistance mechanisms in RECP services
- **Component 2**: Thematic projects
- **Component 3**: Integration of RECP approach in government policy and enterprises

The main objective of the project is the **improvement of economic competitiveness, reduction of the ecological footprint and the strengthening of Tunisian companies**. The main areas of intervention are **food and hospitality, identified as priorities** by UNIDO and Tunisian partners. To achieve the main objective, the following specific objectives are envisaged:

- Capabilities of the NCPC Tunisia will be strengthened in CP, CP tools and in the key areas of intervention;
- NCPC in Tunisia will offer services on the basis of CP and clients are expected to approach CP and CP + services, particularly by introducing incentive mechanisms;
- CP methodology will be set up as a customary practice adopted in Tunisia.

**Beneficiaries** would be:

- Tunisian International Centre for Technology (CITET)
- Domestic companies
- National consultants in own production
- Government institutions
- Financial institutions
- Sectoral Technical Centres (CTS), The Tunisian National Office for Tourism (ONTT)
- Clean technology providers.
The contribution of the NCPC project in Tunisia is divided into **two interventions**, aimed at:

a) Strengthening national competencies to implement basic services and advanced CP in Tunisia (**one part** the project);
b) Development of a regional network of Cleaner Production Centres or equivalent institutions in the MENA (Middle East & North Africa) region. This network will capitalize on the experience of UNIDO in Latin America and the Caribbean, whose program was supported by SECO and the Austrian government (**second part**).

Both interventions aim at strengthening the powers of the NCPC in Tunisia, which will benefit not only the activities carried out in the national context, but also in promoting the sharing of information and experiences on the regional level. In the first case, this will be achieved through intensive training of professionals of various renowned institutions of the country, expanding their knowledge and skills to provide services beyond the Resources and Efficiency Cleaner Production (RECP) to public and private sector organizations. The second intervention will allow the Centre to grow and compete with other institutions already active in the field of RECP through the establishment of a Knowledge and Assistance Management System in the development of tools and methodologies in the regional context. This intervention will enhance the image of the Tunisian Centre as a full member of a regional RECP network. It is expected that the Tunisian Centre plays an important role in the regional component of the project.

**Expected results:**

- The action plans developed in the Tunisian CP project are actually implemented in the participating companies in the project;
- The host institution of the Tunisian CP project pays its consulting activities and services;
- At least 10 experts at CITET master the CP tools and are able to apply them at the enterprise level;
- At least 9 experts at CITET master the CP+ tools and are able to apply them at the enterprise level;
- At least 20 Tunisian experts (at CTS, ONTT and other experts) master the CP+ methodologies and are able to apply them at the enterprise level;
- At least 15 industrial and hotel companies integrate CP+ in the elaboration of their strategies and / or the operational management of their activities;
- At least 25 industrial companies and 50 hotels apply conventional CP concepts;
- At least 100 companies are aware of CP and CP+ services
- Incentive mechanisms facilitate the adoption of the CP approach in general and clean technologies in particular;
- At least 45 companies use the incentive mechanisms of the Tunisian CP project and at least 10 actually benefitting from funding;
- The legislative framework provides a favorable environment for the CP approach;
- The collaboration between the host institution of the Tunisian CP project, CTS, ONTT and national consultants is reinforced.

In addition to the above, SECO expects the project to have the following environmental impact:

- Reduction of 15 to 20% of the energy consumption in companies which approach the CP project services;
- Reduction of 15 to 20% of GHG Emissions (eg CO2) in businesses which approach the services of the CP project;
- Reduction of 15 to 20% of water consumption in the companies which approach the CP services;
- Reduction of 15 to 20% of waste production in companies which approach the CP services;
- Reduction of pollution of the Tunisian coast (Gulf of Tunisia and Gabés).

Regular monitoring is an integral part of project management. It will build upon indicators to monitor the actions and progress and compare them to the planned targets. The indicators will be quantitative (measurable and verifiable), as well as qualitative (verifiable). The data
generated by monitoring can be used during evaluation of the project. A final evaluation is foreseen at the end of the project.

4. Progress report

The progress report (January 2011) covers the time period January – December 2010, the first year of implementation. Overall progress in the achievement of project objectives was 20%.

The following main activities were accomplished:

- The Steering Committee meeting was held in February, the project document, as well as the logical framework, finalized and validated;
- Finalization of the UNIDO-CITET contract for the implementation of CP activities;
- Launch of RECP project in June;
- Selection of international reference center for CP and CP + services; contract signed in October;
- Training in CP held in December with 25 participants;
- Technical workshop held; revision of logical framework;
- Main stakeholders were consulted during project formulation.

Main problems encountered and measures taken:
Preparation of the contracts with CITET as well as with the international reference centre took a few months and hence, the official launch of the project was conducted in June 2010. Further, due to the political situation in Tunisia, a delay in implementation was expected.

5. Budget information

The project budget including supporting costs amounts to for the RECP component EUR 2,524,407 and for the KMS component EUR 331,090. Co-financing by the CITET covers the staff of RECP and operating expense of the office and secretariat. This financing also includes payments of ‘clients’ for RECP services. The UNIDO-SECO funding and client contributions will cover the national expenses related to: information and dissemination; workshops, seminars and local transport; the various measures and some equipment; services included national consultants. The national share grows over 3 years (20%, 40% and 60%).

Budgets on international training, study tours and international conferences will be directly managed by UNIDO and allocated to parties based on the established annual work plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UE/TUN/09/001 – PA</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE/TUN/09/004 – PPPT Phase 1</td>
<td>981,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE/TUN/09/004 – PPPT Phase 2</td>
<td>1,543,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE/TUN/09/005 – Arab KMS</td>
<td>331,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,905,497</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIDO budget execution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>EXECUTED BUDGET in 2010</th>
<th>EXECUTED BUDGET in 2011</th>
<th>EXECUTED BUDGET in 2012</th>
<th>EXECUTED BUDGET in 2013</th>
<th>EXECUTED BUDGET in 2014</th>
<th>EXECUTED BUDGET in 2015 (as of 26 Feb.)</th>
<th>Total expenditure (2010-present (as of 26 Feb.))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International cons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>840,478.78</td>
<td>1,137,977.36</td>
<td>863,559.15</td>
<td>-6,477.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,835,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel</td>
<td>27,204.13</td>
<td>8,962.72</td>
<td>2,160.75</td>
<td>906.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study tours/ in-service training</td>
<td>10,861.08</td>
<td>353.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>5,570.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>14,213.31</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>-374.89</td>
<td>177.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>898,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,147,306</strong></td>
<td><strong>865,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,392</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,905,586</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SAP Database, 26 February 2015)
II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in January 2010 to the completion date. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The terminal evaluation has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO that may help for improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The terminal evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country, or region.

The evaluation team should provide an analysis of the attainment of the main objective and specific objectives under the three core project components. Through its assessments, the evaluation team should enable the Government, counterparts, SECO, UNIDO and other stakeholders and donors to verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in chapter VI.

The key question of the terminal evaluation is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objectives.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The terminal evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy and the UNIDO Guidelines on Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects.

It will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team leader will liaise with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluation team will be required to use, as necessary, different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The evaluation team will develop interview guidelines. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:

   (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and SECO, output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.) and relevant correspondence.

   (b) Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).

   (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. The evaluation team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the intervention. The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders, if necessary.

3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.

4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project’s financial administration and procurement.

5. Interviews with project partners including Government counterparts, and partners that have been selected for co-financing as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.

6. On-site observation of results achieved in demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.

7. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project. The evaluator shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agencies or other organisations.

8. Interviews with the UNIDO Field Office in Tunisia and the project’s management members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities, as necessary.

9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluator and/or UNIDO ODG/EVA.

10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

IV. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as a team leader and one national evaluation consultant.

The evaluation team should be able to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including evaluation verification on request up to two years after completion of the evaluation.

Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions attached to these terms of reference.

Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the programme/projects.

The Project Manager at UNIDO and the Project Team in Tunisia will support the evaluation team.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the period from 15 June 2015 to 31 August 2015. The field mission is planned in June 2015. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in Tunisia.

After the field mission, the evaluation team leader will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the Terminal Evaluation. The draft Terminal evaluation report will be submitted 4-6 weeks after the end of the mission.
VI. Project evaluation parameters

The evaluation team will rate the projects. The **ratings for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters A to J will be presented in the form of a table** with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given.

A. Project design

The evaluation will examine the extent to which:

- the project’s design is adequate to address the problems at hand;
- a participatory project identification process was instrumental in selecting problem areas and national counterparts;
- the project has a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators;
- the project was formulated based on the logical framework (project results framework) approach;
- the project was formulated with the participation of national counterpart and/or target beneficiaries; and
- relevant country representatives (from government, industries and civil society) have been appropriately involved and were participating in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies.

B. Project relevance

The evaluation will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

- National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and population of Tunisia, and regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under “Country ownership/driveness” below.
- Target groups: relevance of the project’s objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g. companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training, etc.).
- Operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the operational program strategies of UNIDO’s industrial resource efficiency unit? Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of Climate Change: Promoting energy efficiency in the industrial sector.
- UNIDO’s thematic priorities: Were they in line with UNIDO’s mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the programme and budget and core competencies?
- Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment? Is there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?

C. Effectiveness: objectives and planned final results at the end of the project

- The evaluation will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes, have been achieved. In detail, the following issues will be assessed: To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from the project.
• How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?

• What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?

• Identify actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below “monitoring of long term changes”). Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.

• Describe any catalytic or replication effects: the evaluation will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project’s catalytic role.

D. Efficiency
The extent to which:

• The project cost was effective? Was the project using the most cost-efficient options?

• Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Are the project’s activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?

• Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?

• Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors’ projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?

E. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes
Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Assessment of sustainability of outcomes will be given special attention but also technical, financial and organization sustainability will be reviewed. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

✓ **Financial risks.** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once project assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.) Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?

✓ **Sociopolitical risks.** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives?

✓ **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
✓ **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to affect the environment, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

**F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems**

- **M&E design.** Did the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the Project M&E plan (see annex 3).

- **M&E plan implementation.** The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Where monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts? Are there any annual work plans? Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance reviews take place regularly?

- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was adequately funded and in a timely manner during implementation.

**G. Monitoring of long-term changes**

The monitoring and evaluation of long-term changes is often incorporated in projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the evaluation report will describe project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

a. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?

b. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?

c. Is the system sustainable—that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?

d. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?

**H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results**

Among other factors, when relevant, the evaluation will consider a number of issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The assessment of these issues can be integrated into the analyses of project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and management as the evaluators find them fit (it is not necessary, however it is possible to have a separate chapter on these aspects in the evaluation report). The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and achievement of project results:

a. **Preparation and readiness / Quality at entry.** Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly
considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?

b. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country—or of participating countries, in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects—approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project’s objectives?

c. **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (i.e. NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies, etc.) and what were their immediate tasks? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?

d. **Financial planning.** Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? Specifically, the evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.

e. **UNIDO’s supervision and backstopping.** Did UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Did UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?

f. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually realized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

g. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

h. **Implementation approach**\(^2\). Is the implementation approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks?

The evaluation team will rate the project performance according to the following four criteria: Project Results, Sustainability, Monitoring and Evaluation, and UNIDO related issues as specified in annex 2. The ratings will be presented in a table with each of the categories rated separately and with brief justifications for the rating based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in the same annex.

---

\(^2\) Implementation approach refers to the concrete manifestation of cooperation between UNIDO, Government counterparts and local implementing partners. Usually POPs projects apply a combination of agency execution (direct provision of services by UNIDO) with elements of national execution through sub-contracts.
I. Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions…)?

- The UNIDO HQ and Field Office based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits…)?

- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms were efficient and effective? Did each partner have specific roles and responsibilities from the beginning till the end? Did each partner fulfill its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions…)? Were the UNIDO HQ based management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs efficient, timely and effective (problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits…)?

J. Assessment of gender mainstreaming

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected gender mainstreaming in the project:

- To which extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

K. Procurement issues

The following evaluation questions that will feed in the Thematic Evaluation on Procurement have been developed and would be included as applicable in all projects (for reference, please see annex 8 of the TOR: UNIDO Procurement Process):

- To what extent does the process provide adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception…)
- Was the procurement timely? How long does the procurement process take (e.g. by value, by category, by exception…)
- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If no, how long were the times gained or delays. If delay, what was the reason(s)?
- Were the procured good(s) acquired at a reasonable price?
- To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity?
- Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no, please elaborate.
- Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If no, please elaborate.
- Who was responsible for the customs clearance? UNIDO FO? UNDP? Government? Other?
- Was the customs clearance handled professionally and in a timely manner? How many days did it take?
- How long time did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption?
- Which were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?
- Which good practices have been identified?
- To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?
- To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders?
VII. Reporting

Inception report

This Terms of Reference provides some information on the evaluation methodology but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager the International Evaluation Consultant will prepare, in collaboration with the national consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Officer. The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and National Consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation –ODG/EVA (the suggested report outline is in Annex 1) and circulated to UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to UNIDO ODG/EVA for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

The evaluation team will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feedback in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

The terminal evaluation report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 1.

Evaluation work plan

The “Evaluation Work Plan” includes the following main products:

1. Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology: Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the Methodology, the desk review could be completed.

2. Inception report: At the time for departure to the field mission, the complete gamete of received materials have been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.

3. Field mission: The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field missions, coordinate with the Government. At the end of the field mission, there will

---

3 The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation.
be a presentation of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.

4. **Preliminary findings from the field mission:** Following the field mission, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared and presented in the field and at UNIDO Headquarters.

5. **A draft terminal evaluation report** will be forwarded electronically to the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and circulated to main stakeholders.

6. **Final terminal evaluation report** will incorporate comments received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation phases</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Development of methodology approach and evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing with UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, Project Managers and other key stakeholders at HQ</td>
<td>Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during field mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Inception evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct of field mission</td>
<td>Presentation of main findings to key stakeholders in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present preliminary findings and recommendations to key stakeholders at the field</td>
<td>Presentation slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ</td>
<td>Presentation slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the data collected</td>
<td>Draft terminal evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation of the draft report to UNIDO/relevant stakeholders and revision</td>
<td>Final terminal evaluation report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. Quality assurance**

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by the Office for Independent Evaluation).

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as annex 4. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO’s evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, and circulated within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.
Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary
- Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main evaluation findings and recommendations
- Must present strengths and weaknesses of the project
- Must be self-explanatory and should be 3-4 pages in length

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process
- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

II. Countries and project background
- Brief countries context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment
This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the TOR (see section VI Project Evaluation Parameters). Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources. The evaluators’ assessment can be broken into the following sections:

A. Design
B. Relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries)
C. Effectiveness (The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
D. Efficiency (Report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner Countries contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
E. Sustainability of Project Outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (Report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and Budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
G. Monitoring of long-term changes
H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (Report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)
I. Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)

---

4 Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)
J. Gender mainstreaming
K. Procurement issues

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in Annex 2.

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

This section should include a storyline of the main evaluation conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every evaluation criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the evaluation report.

B. Recommendations

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should:

- be based on evaluation findings
- realistic and feasible within a project context
- indicate institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
- be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:
- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons learned

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation
- For each lesson the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated

Annexes should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.
### Annex 2 - Overall ratings table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Evaluator’s summary comments</th>
<th>Evaluator’s rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating), sub criteria (below)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability of project outcomes (overall rating)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub criteria (below)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopolitical risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional framework and governance risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and evaluation (overall rating)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub criteria (below)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Plan implementation (use for adaptive management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting and funding for M&amp;E activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIDO specific ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality at entry / Preparation and readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO Supervision and backstopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

- **Highly satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Moderately satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Unsatisfactory (U):** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Highly unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Please note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.
RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits beyond project completion. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

- Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E design’, ‘M&E plan implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory (S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”
Annex 4 - Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO project:

**PROJECT TITLE:**

**PROJECT NUMBER:**

**CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report quality criteria</th>
<th>UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation: Assessment notes</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report structure and quality of writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report is written in clear language, correct grammar and use of evaluation terminology. The report is logically structured with clarity and coherence. It contains a concise executive summary and all other necessary elements as per TOR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation objective, scope and methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation objective is explained and the scope defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods employed are explained and appropriate for answering the evaluation questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report describes the data sources and collection methods and their limitations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation report was delivered in a timely manner so that the evaluation objective (e.g. important deadlines for presentations) was not affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation object</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is clearly described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object are described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles are described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings and conclusions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report is consistent and the evidence is complete (covering all aspects defined in the TOR) and convincing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The report presents an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives.

The report presents an assessment of relevant external factors (assumptions, risks, impact drivers) and how they influenced the evaluation object and the achievement of results.

The report presents a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or it explains why this is not (yet) possible.

The report analyses the budget and actual project costs.

Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.

Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, are identified as much as possible.

Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.

Relevant cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights, environment are appropriately covered.

**Recommendations and lessons learned**

The lessons and recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions presented in the report.

The recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations (‘who?’ ‘what?’ ‘where?’ ‘when?’).

Recommendations are implementable and take resource implications into account.

Lessons are readily applicable in other contexts and suggest prescriptive action.

**Rating system for quality of evaluation reports**

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.
Annex 6 – Job descriptions

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>International evaluation consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Duty Station and Location:</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions:</td>
<td>Missions to Vienna, Austria and Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract:</td>
<td>15 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract:</td>
<td>31 August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Working Days:</td>
<td>21 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

UNIDO is the specialized intergovernmental organization that supports Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) in developing and transition countries. Its areas of intervention cover industrial resource efficiency and sustainable production, trade capacity building and productive capacity building.

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RECP) is an exemplary intervention area aimed at mobilizing enterprises, in particular small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) from the manufacturing and related productive sectors to ‘green’ their operations and become more efficient in the use of natural resources (materials, energy and water) and less polluting (in terms of waste water, waste and emissions).

Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production applies preventive environmental management techniques and total productivity practices with the triple aim of improving the efficient use of natural resources (materials, energy and water), minimizing the generation of wastes and emissions, and reducing the risks of industrial operations to workers, consumers and communities. Experiences from 1000s of enterprises globally representing all key manufacturing and related productive sectors have demonstrated that adopting RECP can be good for business, environment and climate, and ultimately development at large.

Detailed background information of each project can be found in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the terminal evaluation.
### 3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Working Days</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument of 3A accordingly (if needed); Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project’s activities and analyze other background info.</td>
<td>• Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; • Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country’s legislative and regulatory framework.</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Briefing with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ. Preparation of the Inception Report</td>
<td>• Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant. • Inception Report</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct field mission to Tunisia in June 2015⁵.</td>
<td>• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Presentations of the evaluation’s initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the missions.</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ⁶</td>
<td>• After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prepare the evaluation report according to TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the National</td>
<td>• Draft evaluation report.</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts. Two or all three missions may be carried out consecutively.

⁶ The debriefings at Vienna could be combined for two or all three countries, depending on the timing of field missions. The advantage of a joint presentation is that similarities and differences between countries can be compared and discussed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Working Days</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.</td>
<td>• Final evaluation report.</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:**

Advanced degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Minimum 10 years’ experience in energy efficiency projects
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks.
- Knowledge of and experience in environmental projects management and/or evaluation (of development projects)
- Working experience in developing countries
- Experience in evaluation of energy projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset

**Languages:**

Fluency in written and spoken English and French is required.

**Reporting and deliverables**

1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents;

2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
   - Presentation of initial findings of the mission;
   - Draft report;
   - Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.

3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:
   - Presentation and discussion of findings;
   - Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation report.

All reports and related documents must be in English and presented in electronic format (MS Word).
REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:
1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:
1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

Managerial competencies (as applicable):
1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation.
Title: National evaluation consultant  
Main Duty Station and Location: Home-based  
Mission/s to: Travel to potential sites  
Start of Contract: 15 June 2015  
End of Contract: 31 August 2015  
Number of Working Days: 21 days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The National Evaluation Consultant will evaluate the projects according to the Terms of Reference under the leadership of the Team Leader (International Evaluation Consultant). S/he will perform the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); in cooperation with the Team Leader: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in both English and French (questionnaires, logic models) to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys during and prior to the field missions; Coordinate and lead interviews/ surveys in local language and assist the Team Leader with translation | • List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions  
• Drafting and presentation of brief assessment of the adequacy of the country’s legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project. | 4 days          | Home-based   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>where necessary; Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework in Tunisia, specifically in the context of the project’s objectives and targets; provide analysis and advice to the Team Leader on existing and appropriate policies for Tunisia for input to the terminal evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all available project outputs/publications/feedback; Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders. Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with the Project Management Unit. Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the Team Leader in the Preparation of the Inception Report.</td>
<td>• Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. • Division of evaluation tasks with the Team Leader. • Inception Report.</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based (telephone interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the Team Leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required; Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</td>
<td>• Presentations of the evaluation’s initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</td>
<td>7 days (including travel days)</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader.</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report prepared.</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.</td>
<td>Final evaluation report prepared.</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in environmental science, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in industrial energy efficiency and/or climate change.

Technical and functional experience:
- A minimum of five years practical experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries.
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project in the Ministry of Industry and Trade is desirable.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English and French is required.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:
1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:
1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

Managerial competencies (as applicable):
1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Office for Independent Evaluation.
Annex 7 – Project results framework (logical framework)

Phase 1:

**Objectif global:** contribuer à l’amélioration continue de la compétitivité économique, la réduction de l’empreinte écologique et le renforcement du développement social des entreprises tunisiennes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectif spécifique</th>
<th>Activité / services</th>
<th>Indicateurs de résultats</th>
<th>Moyens de vérification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Les capacités de l’institution hôte du PPPT sont renforcées dans les outils PP, les thématiques PP+ et dans les secteurs clé d’intervention</td>
<td>1.1. <strong>Formation PP:</strong> le personnel de l’institution hôte du PPPT et les institutions techniques partenaires reçoivent une formation intensive sur les outils PP (QuickScan+, diagnostic en entreprise, guides sectoriels, technologies propres) et sur leur application dans les secteurs clé d’intervention selon leurs besoins</td>
<td>Au moins 5 membres du CITET sont des experts PP respectés pour chaque secteur clé d’intervention identifié comme prioritaire</td>
<td>Documents des formations, Listes de présence, Rapports de mission des formateurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. <strong>Formation PP+:</strong> le personnel de l’institution hôte du PPPT et les institutions techniques partenaires reçoivent une formation intensive sur les thématiques PP+ (ACV, EI et RSE)</td>
<td>Au moins 3 membres du CITET sont des experts affirmés pour chaque thématique PP+ Au moins 20 experts tunisiens (CTS, ONTT, autres experts) maîtrisent les outils PP+</td>
<td>Documents des formations, Listes de présence, Rapports de mission des formateurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. <strong>Mise en réseau:</strong> l’institution hôte du PPPT développe et maintient un réseau effectif sur les plans national et international, notamment dans le cadre du réseau des centres nationaux de PP arabes</td>
<td>Participation à 2 événements par année (au minimum une personne/événement) L’institution hôte du PPPT est un membre formel du réseau des centres nationaux de PP arabes et du réseau mondial de l’ONUDI</td>
<td>Documents des événements, Rapports annuels de l’institution hôte du PPPT, Rapports d’activité du réseau des centres nationaux de PP arabes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Le PPPT propose des services basés sur les thématiques PP+ et les clients font appel aux services de PP et PP+, notamment via les mécanismes incitatifs</td>
<td>2.1 <strong>Promotion</strong> des outils PP et PP+ lors de séminaires et conférences</td>
<td>200 entreprises sont sensibilisées aux concepts classiques de PP 100 entreprises sont sensibilisées aux outils PP+</td>
<td>Documents des séminaires et conférences, Listes de présences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. <strong>Analyse de cycle de vie (ACV):</strong> l’ACV est adaptée et utilisée comme outil d’aide à la décision, notamment comme soutien en vue de l’attribution des écolabels</td>
<td>Les outils ACV (logiciel et bases de données) sont adaptés au contexte tunisien Un outil d’appui à l’attribution des écolabels est développé sur la base de la méthodologie de l’ACV</td>
<td>Logiciels ACV et base de données, Rapport explicatif et logiciel d’ACV comme outil d’appui à l’attribution des écolabels, Rapports de mission des experts internationaux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3. Ecologie industrielle (EI)

**EI** est un concept appliqué dans l’industrie tunisienne.

- Appui au projet ReCapZi (GTZ)
- Appui à la bourse des déchets industriels
- Partenariat tourisme – industrie fondé sur l’EI

**Rapports sur les appuis à ces deux projets**
- Contrat de partenariat entre le tourisme et l’industrie fondé sur l’EI
- Rapports de mission des experts internationaux

### 2.4. Responsabilité sociétale des entreprises (RSE)

La RSE est proposées aux entreprises tunisiennes.

- L’assistance pour la mise en œuvre de la norme ISO 26'000 est un service du PPPT

**Documents de promotion du PPPT**
- Rapports de mission des experts internationaux

### 2.5. Services de PP

Études sur les technologies propres, QuickScan+ et diagnostics en entreprises sont demandés.

- Système de veille sur les technologies propres
- 25 entreprises industrielles appliquent les concepts classiques de PP
- 50 hôtels appliquent les concepts classiques de PP
- Réduction de 15 à 20% de la consommation énergétique
- Réduction de 15 à 20% des émissions de GES (par exemple, CO2)
- Réduction de 15 à 20% de la consommation d’eau
- Réduction de 15 à 20% de la production de déchets
- Réduction de la pollution du littoral tunisien (Golfes de Tunis et de Gabès)

**Documents explicatifs sur le système de veille sur les technologies propres**
- Rapports techniques
- Réaction des clients
- Rapport national sur l’état de l’environnement du MEDD
- Statistiques du MEDD
2.6. **Services de PP+**: le PPPT offre les services basés sur l’ACV, l’EI, la RSE,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services offerts</th>
<th>Statistiques</th>
<th>Rapports techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ACV sont effectuées en entreprise</td>
<td>Rapports techniques</td>
<td>Réactions des clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 études d’EI sont menées</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapport national sur l’état de l’environnement du MEDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 entreprises industrielles appliquent les principes de la RSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistiques du MEDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hôtels appliquent les principes de la RSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réduction de 15 à 20% de la consommation énergétique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réduction de 15 à 20% des émissions de GES (par exemple, CO2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réduction de 15 à 20% de la consommation d’eau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réduction de 15 à 20% de la production de déchets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réduction de la pollution du littoral tunisien (Golfs de Tunis et de Gabès)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. La méthodologie PP est mise en place comme pratique habituelle et adoptée en Tunisie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thème</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. <strong>Diffusion de l’information</strong>: études de cas disponibles pour les parties tierces</td>
<td>Un réseau informel de consultants nationaux de PP est en place et débouche sur des propositions de projet conjointes</td>
<td>Fiches synthétiques de promotion des actions entreprises dans le cadre du PPPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Propositions de projet conjointes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. <strong>Mécanismes incitatifs</strong>: les aspects juridiques de tous les mécanismes incitatifs existants sont maîtrisés par le PPPT, connus des entreprises et des propositions d’amélioration sont formulées par le PPPT</td>
<td>Guide des mécanismes incitatifs de la PP en Tunisie est élaborée</td>
<td>Guide des mécanismes incitatifs de la PP en Tunisie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propositions d’amélioration des mécanismes incitatifs existants soumises aux autorités compétentes</td>
<td>Des 90 entreprises ayant bénéficié des services de PP, au moins 45 ont fait appel aux mécanismes incitatifs et 10 d’entre elles bénéficient effectivement d’un financement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. <strong>Prix de la RSE</strong>: la RSE contribue à orienter la culture d’entreprise tunisienne vers plus de proactivité en termes de protection de l’environnement et de développement social</td>
<td>Lancement d’une première session du prix national de RSE sur la base du GRI dans les secteurs cle d’intervention</td>
<td>Documents explicatifs du prix national de RSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Articles de presse sur le prix national de RSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. <strong>Cadre législatif</strong>: assistance dans la formulation et la mise en œuvre de normes pour créer un environnement favorable à la PP</td>
<td>La PP est mentionnée comme approche préventive dans les documents de stratégie nationale</td>
<td>Documents de stratégie nationale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 2: Projet de production propre tunisien PPPT +

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Propre– Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (avant COPIL du 04.02.2014)</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (après COPIL du 04.02.2014)</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>External Factors (assumptions / risks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy of Intervention</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tunisie</strong></td>
<td><strong>Means of Verification</strong></td>
<td><strong>External Factors (assumptions / risks)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le PPPT prévoit sur une durée de 4 ans le renforcement des capacités pour la mise à niveau environnementale des entreprises, par un appui au CITET – désigné comme CNPP (Centre National de Production Propre) – et le renforcement des capacités nationales en matière de production propre.</td>
<td>- Les capacités de l'institution hôte sont renforcées dans les outils PP, les thématiques PP+ et dans les secteurs clés d'intervention</td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Publications officielles des agences et administrations tunisiennes</td>
<td>- Stabilité de l'équipe formée au sein du CITET et transmission du savoir-faire en cas de changement d'équipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Le CITET propose des services basés sur les thématiques PP+ et les clients font appel aux services de PP et PP+ via les mécanismes incitatifs</td>
<td>- La méthodologie PP est pérennisée au niveau des entreprises de la Tunisie.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Rapports d’activité des zones industrielles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Les capacités de l'institution hôte sont renforcées dans les outils PP, les thématiques PP+ et dans les secteurs clés d'intervention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Rapports d’activité du centre de référence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Le CITET propose des services basés sur les thématiques PP+ et les clients font appel aux services de PP et PP+ via les mécanismes incitatifs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- La méthodologie PP est pérennisée au niveau des entreprises de la Tunisie.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outputs (outcome 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (outcome 1)</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (avant COPIL du 04.02.2014)</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (après COPIL du 04.02.2014)</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>External Factors (assumptions / risks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Renforcement des capacités nationales à gérer des projets internationaux en matière de production propre (coordination, suivi, marketing)</td>
<td>- Formation de 20 experts nationaux à la démarche de production propre (PP)</td>
<td>- Formation de 20 experts nationaux à la démarche de production propre (PP)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Manque d'engagement du CITET dans la réalisation du guide PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Formation complémentaire axée sur la pratique et l'application de la méthode PP à des secteurs spécifiques</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Réalisation d’un guide méthodologique PP par le CITET avec l’appui des experts internationaux</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Liste des experts nationaux formés</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Guide méthodologique PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Améliorer la compétitivité économique des entreprises par une meilleure efficacité de production et réduire l’impact sur l’environnement en diminuant la production de déchets et les émissions vers l’environnement.</td>
<td>- Evaluation PP de 75 entreprises tunisiennes réparties dans 5 secteurs Textile et habillement, Cuir et Chaussures, Hôtellerie, Traitement de surface (métaux) et Agro-alimentaire</td>
<td>- Evaluation PP de 54 (20+21+13) entreprises tunisiennes réparties sur 3 phases dans 5 secteurs Textile et habillement, Cuir et Chaussures, Hôtellerie, Traitement de surface (métaux) et Agro-alimentaire</td>
<td>- Rapports de projet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3 Renforcer les capacités du personnel des entreprises tunisiennes pour ancrer la démarche de production propre durablement et contribuer à l’amélioration continue de leur performance

- 4 sessions de formation organisées au profit du personnel des entreprises
- 60-100 personnes formées au sein de la direction et de l’équipe technique des 57 entreprises bénéficiaires
- Liste des personnes formées
- non engagement des entreprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energie - Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Les technologies d'efficience énergétique et de production d'énergie renouvelable sont de plus en plus introduites sur le marché tunisien et utilisées par les secteurs industriels clés</td>
<td>- Augmentation du nombre d’entreprises qui adoptent ce type de technologies</td>
<td>- idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nombre d’emplois créés dans le secteur de la maîtrise de l’énergie</td>
<td>- Statistiques tenues par les organismes tunisiens en charge de la promotion de la maîtrise de l’énergie (ANME, STEG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Renforcement de l’offre de formation tunisienne en matière de maîtrise de l’énergie</td>
<td>- Observations de terrain rapportées par les différents partenaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Impact d’autres projets de renforcement de la maîtrise de l’énergie et de développement des ER pouvant engendrer des synergies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Fiabilité et actualité des statistiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Opportunités d’emplois créées par d’autres projets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (outcome 2)</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Installation de technologies innovantes pour répondre de façon optimale aux besoins des entreprises</td>
<td>- Min. 50 entreprises (ou 75% des entreprises participantes) ont entrepris des mesures d’amélioration de leur performance énergétique concrètes et significatives</td>
<td>- idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Observations rapportées par les experts après visite des entreprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Rapports de projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Rapports d’activités des entreprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Les entreprises disposent de peu de moyens financiers et devront être convaincues de l’attractivité des solutions proposées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Les mécanismes financiers disponibles sont mis à contribution pour renforcer l’attractivité des solutions proposées</td>
<td>- Coût d’investissement et/ou retour sur investissement attractif pour les entreprises</td>
<td>- idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Rapports de faisabilité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Document présentant les sources de financement pour les entreprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Rapport de projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Les solutions proposées devront tenir compte de critères spécifiques pour pouvoir profiter des mécanismes financiers, ce qui peut limiter la liberté du choix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Le savoir-faire suisse en matière de maîtrise de l’énergie est mis à contribution pour apporter des solutions attractives</td>
<td>- Programme de formation suisse adapté au contexte tunisien</td>
<td>- idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technologies innovantes suisses et internationales sélectionnées en fonction de critères techniques et économiques</td>
<td>- Modules de formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Devis comparatifs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Rapports de faisabilité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Rapport de projet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- idem</td>
<td>- Les technologies suisses proposées peuvent ne pas correspondre aux attentes du projet (critères techniques et/ou économiques)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Mise en place de modules</td>
<td>- 60 ingénieurs tunisien(ne)s</td>
<td>- Liste des participants au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 60 ingénieurs tunisien(ne)s</td>
<td>- Au terme du projet : objectif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologie Industrielle – Outcome 3</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les principaux acteurs tunisiens concernés (gouvernement, secteur privé) sont convaincus des bénéfices offerts par une stratégie d’écologie industrielle (EI) et contribuent à diffuser et mettre en œuvre cette démarche</td>
<td>Intégration de la démarche d’EI dans les politiques publiques</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Réplication du projet d’application des outils EI en zone industrielle</td>
<td>Publications officielles des agences et administrations tunisiennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Création d’un centre de référence EI en Tunisie</td>
<td>Rapports d’activité des zones industrielles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mise en œuvre des outils EI sur une deuxième zone d’application, permettant d’obtenir plus de résultats</td>
<td>Rapports d’activité du centre de référence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (outcome 3)</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Les principaux développeurs et gestionnaires des zones industrielles tunisiennes (GMG) sont au fait des potentiels d’une démarche d’EI, ils disposent des arguments nécessaires pour communiquer auprès des</td>
<td>35 membres des GMG sont formés à l’approche EI et bénéficient du soutien des experts nationaux formés dans le cadre du PPPT</td>
<td>Liste des participants (formation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mise en œuvre des outils EI sur une deuxième zone d’application, permettant d’obtenir plus de résultats</td>
<td>Le rôle et les capacités des GMG sont en pleine évolution (risque et opportunité)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>idem</td>
<td>Barrières liées à l’évolution de la situation politique en Tunisie, car la collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
entreprises et peuvent baser leurs actions sur des exemples d’application concrète probants dans le contexte tunisien entre acteurs économiques nécessite un climat de confiance et de stabilité

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2. Les principaux décideurs concernés sont mobilisés en vue de gagner leur soutien aux futures démarches EI en Tunisie</th>
<th>- Organisation de workshops et tables rondes pour réunir les décideurs concernés autour de potentiels concrèts offerts par l’EI en Tunisie</th>
<th>- idem Notes de synthèse produites à l’issue des workshops</th>
<th>- Le projet peut s’intégrer dans les réflexions sur les futures pôles industriels en développement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3. La mise en œuvre des mesures d’amélioration et synergies identifiées au cours du projet est stimulée et facilitée</strong></td>
<td>- Réalisation d’études de faisabilité plus poussées pour réduire les risques d’investissement pour les entreprises</td>
<td>- idem - Rapports d’études de faisabilité - Liste exhaustive des sources de financement externe identifiées - Rapports de suivi</td>
<td>- Barrières administratives réduisant l’accès aux financements pour les entreprises (à identifier et si possible contourner)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ecoinvent-ACV - Outcome 4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcome Indicators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfert de savoir-faire dans le domaine des analyses de cycle de vie et amélioration des performances environnementales et économiques des entreprises bénéficiaires</strong></td>
<td>- Les consultants et centres techniques tunisiens ainsi que le CITET adoptent la méthode ACV et participent activement à son développement</td>
<td>- idem Rapport de projet - Feedback des partenaires de projets - Feedback à court et moyen terme du Centre ecoinvent qui fournit les données pour la réalisation d’ACV - Bilan de suivi des entreprises dans la phase de mise en œuvre des mesures d’amélioration - Rapports et bilans d’entreprises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outputs (outcome 4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output Indicators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1. Mise en place d’une base de données de référence pour la Tunisie (ecoinvent)</strong></td>
<td>- 10-15 jeux de données d’ICV spécifiques pour la Tunisie sont créés (démarche itérative : le nombre exact de jeux de données nécessaires sera identifié en cours de projet)</td>
<td>- 31-37 jeux de données d’ICV spécifiques pour la Tunisie sont créés : 17 jeux de données sur des produits (issus des ACV réalisées), 14-20 jeux de données liés au traitement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Extension de la base à la région Maghreb</td>
<td>- Évaluation de la possibilité d'extension par le Centre ecoinvent</td>
<td>- Évaluation de la possibilité d'extension par le Centre ecoinvent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Formation d'experts nationaux aux méthodes d'ACV et de collecte de données d'inventaires de cycle de vie</td>
<td>- Au moins 16 experts nationaux tunisiens formés</td>
<td>- Au moins 16 experts nationaux tunisiens formés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. Les analyses réalisées permettent la production de données fiables et exhaustives pour améliorer les produits ou services sélectionnés</td>
<td>Sur la base des 8 ACV réalisées, des mesures correctives sont formulées</td>
<td>- Sur la base des 5 ACV réalisées, des mesures correctives sont formulées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5. Les analyses réalisées permettent d'émettre des recommandations en vue de réduire l'impact environnemental et d'améliorer la compétitivité des produits analysés</td>
<td>- Les recommandations formulées sur la base des ACV réalisées pourront servir à l’élaboration de politiques et réglementations sectorielles</td>
<td>- idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6. Les analyses réalisées permettent de remplir les exigences nécessaires pour une écolabelisation des produits ou services sélectionnés</td>
<td>Des données sont disponibles pour le volet du PPPT consacré aux écolabels.</td>
<td>Des données sont disponibles pour les activités du CITET consacrées aux écolabels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Footprint (WFP) – Outcome 5</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transfert de savoir-faire dans le domaine de la méthode d'analyse Water Footprint et amélioration des performances environnementales et économiques des entreprises bénéficiaires | - Les consultants et centres techniques tunisiens ainsi que le CITET adoptent la méthode WFP et participent activement à son développement  
- Réduction de l’impact eau des entreprises  
- Création de valeur ajoutée pour certains produits/services produits par les entreprises | - idem | - Rapport de projet  
- Feedback des partenaires de projets  
- Bilan de suivi des entreprises dans la phase de mise en œuvre des mesures d’amélioration  
- Rapports et bilans d’entreprises |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (outcome 5)</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 Formation d’experts nationaux aux méthodes WFP | - Au moins 16 experts nationaux tunisiens formés  
- 2 WFP réalisées sur la base des données collectées permettant aux consultants locaux d’éprouver la méthode | - idem | - Liste des experts formés  
- Rapports WFP  
- Manque d’identification à l’approche de la part des experts  
La méthode WFP ne convient pas pour certaines entreprises sélectionnées (d’autres méthodes doivent être privilégiées dans ce cas) |
| 5.2 Les analyses réalisées permettent la production de données fiables et exhaustives pour améliorer les produits ou services sélectionnés | - Sur la base des 2 WFP réalisées, des mesures correctives sont formulées | - idem | - Rapports de WFP  
La fiabilité des WFP dépend de la qualité des données récoltées dans la phase de collecte |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hôtellerie durable – Outcome 6</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Le secteur du tourisme est renforcé grâce à la l’amélioration des performances sociales, économiques et environnementales des hôtels | - Diminution des impacts négatifs sociaux et environnementaux liés aux activités du secteur hôtelier  
- Optimisation de l’influence positive du secteur hôtelier sur son environnement direct (personnel et collaborateurs) et indirect (communautés locales, nature environnante) | - idem | - Bilan annuel des hôtels (qui devront si possible intégrer des paramètres de performance sociale et environnementale)  
- Rapports d’audit  
- La stabilité du contexte socio-politique tunisien a une grande influence sur l’attractivité du secteur touristique |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (outcome 6)</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6.1. La Tunisie dispose des capacités nécessaires pour développer une approche intégrée de gestion durable pour le secteur hôtelier

- 10 consultants sont formés
- Un centre d’excellence est mis en place au sein d’une organisation locale
- 10 consultants sont formés, dont 5 sont sélectionnés pour appliquer la méthode au sein des hôtels
- Les 5 consultants sélectionnés bénéficient d’une formation complémentaire pour accompagner les hôtels vers la certification Travelife 2014, qui inclut des critères sociaux, environnementaux et économiques
- Liste des participants et des consultants sélectionnés
- Rapport de projet
- Les consultants formés ont exprimé la volonté de repliquer la méthode transmise, qui leur apporte une plus-value sur le marché

6.2. Les hôtels renforcent leur performance managériale et sociale, leurs partenaires et clients sont sensibilisés

- 10 hôtels entreprennent une démarche intégrée de gestion durable et développent des dialogues constructifs avec leurs parties prenantes
- Rapport de projet
- Rapport d’évaluation du projet
- Motivation des différents acteurs impliqués et intérêt pour la démarche proposée

6.3. Les hôtels renforcent leur attractivité grâce aux labels internationaux de tourisme durable

- Au moins 3 hôtels s’engagent dans une certification durable (ex : label Travelife ou Green globe)
- Au moins 5 hôtels s’engagent dans une certification durable (Travelife 2014) et bénéficient d’un accompagnement par les experts nationaux et internationaux
- Rapport de suivi
- Certificat témoignant de l’obtention du label
- Possibilité que le timing des procédures de certification Travelife ne permet pas aux hôtels participants d’obtenir la certification en 2014

### Mesures de renforcement - Outcome 7

#### Outcome Indicators

| Les capacités des institutions nationales (CITET, CTS, ONTT) sont renforcées en matière de gestion, mise en œuvre et promotion des projets de production propre au niveau des entreprises |
| - Amélioration du rythme de travail et du respect des échéances |
| - Obtention de résultats optimaux (adéquation et mise en œuvre des mesures d’amélioration) |
| - Amélioration de la visibilité du projet |
| - Renforcement de l’expertise nationale en matière de PP |
| - idem |
| idem |
| Rapports de projet |
| Matériel de promotion |
| La motivation de l’équipe du CITET et son assiduité au travail dépend également des conditions de travail sur lesquelles le projet n’a que peu d’influence |

#### Outputs (outcome 7)

| L’équipe CITET est formée et coachée par un expert international Sofies à plein temps |
| - Suivi continu des entreprises |
| - Production de matériel de promotion |
| - Etablissement de synergies avec les autres programmes |
| - idem |
| Rapports de projet |
| Matériel de promotion |
### 7.2. Renforcement de l’expertise sectorielle des CTS

- Les experts des CTS sont encadrés par une sélection d’experts sectoriels
- Les mesures proposées aux entreprises sont techniquement optimales
- idem

- Rapports de projet
- Liste des experts bénéficiaires
- Liste des experts indiquant leurs compétences spécifiques pour le projet
- La motivation des consultants nationaux à apprendre des experts internationaux dépend également de leurs conditions de travail

### 7.3. Les experts nationaux ayant de bonnes performances sont motivés par la possibilité d’effectuer des voyages d’études internationaux leur permettant de perfectionner leur formation en matière de PP

- Des voyages d’études internationaux sont proposés aux experts nationaux présentant les meilleures performances
- Ces voyages d’études leur permettront de mieux maîtriser les solutions technologiques et méthodologiques avancées en matière de PP
- Des voyages d’études internationaux sont proposés aux experts nationaux présentant les meilleures performances
- Ces voyages d’études leur permettront de mieux maîtriser les solutions technologiques et méthodologiques avancées en matière de PP, d’écologie industrielle et d’ACV

- Liste des experts nationaux sélectionnés
- Liste des voyages d’études effectués
- Rapport de projet
- Disponibilité et motivation des experts sélectionnés pour effectuer les voyages d’études
Annex 8 – UNIDO Procurement process

UNIDO Procurement process

Generic approach and assessment framework

1. Introduction

This document outlines an approach and encompasses a framework for the assessment of UNIDO procurement processes, to be included as part of country evaluations as well as in technical cooperation (TC) projects/programmes evaluations.

The procurement process assessment will review in a systematic manner the various aspects and stages of the procurement process being a key aspect of the technical cooperation (TC) delivery. These reviews aim to diagnose and identify areas of strength as well as where there is a need for improvement and lessons.

The framework will also serve as the basis for the “thematic evaluation of the procurement process efficiency” to be conducted in 2015 as part of the ODG/EVA work programme for 2014-15.

2. Background

Procurement is defined as the overall process of acquiring goods, works, and services, and includes all related functions such as planning, forecasting, supply chain management, identification of needs, sourcing and solicitation of offers, preparation and award of contract, as well as contract administration until the final discharge of all obligations as defined in the relevant contract(s). The procurement process covers activities necessary for the purchase, rental, lease or sale of goods, services, and other requirements such as works and property.

Past project and country evaluations commissioned by ODG/EVA raised several issues related to procurement and often efficiency related issues. It also became obvious that there is a shared responsibility in the different stages of the procurement process which includes UNIDO staff, such as project managers, and staff of the procurement unit, government counterparts, suppliers, local partner agencies (i.e. UNDP), customs and transport agencies etc.

In July 2013, a new “UNIDO Procurement Manual” was introduced. This Procurement Manual provides principles, guidance and procedures for the Organization to attain specified standards in the procurement process. The Procurement Manual also establishes that “The principles of fairness, transparency, integrity, economy, efficiency and effectiveness must be applied for all procurement transactions, to be delivered with a high level of professionalism thus justifying UNIDO’s involvement in and adding value to the implementation process”.

To reduce the risk of error, waste or wrongful acts and the risk of not detecting such problems, no single individual or team controls shall control all key stages of a transaction. Duties and responsibilities shall be assigned systemically to a number of individuals to ensure that effective checks and balances are in place.

In UNIDO, authorities, responsibilities and duties are segregated where incompatible. Related duties shall be subject to regular review and monitoring. Discrepancies, deviations and exceptions are properly regulated in the Financial Regulations and Rules and the Staff Regulations and Rules. Clear segregation of duties is maintained between programme/project management, procurement and supply chain management, risk management, financial management and accounting as well as auditing and internal oversight. Therefore, segregation of duties is an important basic principle of internal control and must be observed throughout the procurement process.
The different stages of the procurement process should be carried out, to the extent possible, by separate officials with the relevant competencies. As a minimum, two officials shall be involved in carrying out the procurement process. The functions are segregated among the officials belonging to the following functions:

- **Procurement Services**: For carrying out centralized procurement, including review of technical specifications, terms of reference, and scope of works, market research/surveys, sourcing/solicitation, commercial evaluation of offers, contract award, contract management;
- **Substantive Office**: For initiating procurement requests on the basis of well formulated technical specifications, terms of reference, scope of works, ensuring availability of funds, technical evaluation of offers; award recommendation; receipt of goods/services; supplier performance evaluation. In respect of decentralized procurement, the segregation of roles occur between the Project Manager/Allotment Holder and his/her respective Line Manager. For Fast Track procurement, the segregate on occurs between the Project Manager/Allotment Holder and Financial Services;
- **Financial Services**: For processing payments.

Figure 1 presents a preliminary “Procurement Process Map”, showing the main stages, stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities. During 2014/2015, in preparation for the thematic evaluation of the procurement process in 2015, this process map/ workflow will be further refined and reviewed.

### Figure 1: UNIDO Procurement Process Map

3. **Purpose**

The purpose of the procurement process assessments is to diagnose and identify areas for possible improvement and to increase UNIDO’s learning about strengths and weaknesses in the procurement process. It will also include an assessment of the adequacy of the ‘Procurement Manual’ as a guiding document.

The review is intended to be useful to managers and staff at UNIDO headquarters and in the field offices (project managers, procurement officers), who are the direct involved in procurement and to UNIDO management.

4. **Scope and focus**
Procurement process assessments will focus on the efficiency aspects of the procurement process, and hence it will mainly fall under the efficiency evaluation criterion. However, other criteria such as effectiveness will also be considered as needed.

These assessments are expected to be mainstreamed in all UNIDO country and project evaluations to the extent of its applicability in terms of inclusion of relevant procurement related budgets and activities. A generic evaluation matrix has been developed and is found in Annex B. However questions should be customized for individual projects when needed.

5. Key issues and evaluation questions

Past evaluations and preliminary consultations have highlighted the following aspects or identified the following issues:

- Timeliness. Delays in the delivery of items to end-users.
- Bottlenecks. Points in the process where the process stops or considerably slows down.
- Procurement manual introduced, but still missing subsidiary templates and tools for its proper implementation and full use.
- Heavy workload of the procurement unit and limited resources and increasing “procurement demand”
- Lack of resources for initiating improvement and innovative approaches to procurement (such as Value for Money instead of lowest price only, Sustainable product lifecycle, environmental friendly procurement, etc.)
- The absence of efficiency parameters (procurement KPIs)

On this basis, the following evaluation questions have been developed and would be included as applicable in all project and country evaluations in 2014-2015:

- To what extent does the process provide adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception…)
- Was the procurement timely? How long the procurement process takes (e.g. by value, by category, by exception…)
- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If no, how long were the times gained or delays. If delay, what was the reason(s)?
- Were the procured good(s) acquired at a reasonable price?
- To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity?
- Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no, pleased elaborate.
- Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget?. If no, pleased elaborate.
- Who was responsible for the customs clearance? UNIDO FO? UNDP? Government? Other?
- Was the customs clearance handled professionally and in a timely manner? How many days did it take?
- How long time did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption?
- Which were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?
- Which good practices have been identified?
- To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?
- To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders?

6. Evaluation method and tools

These assessments will be based on a participatory approach, involving all relevant stakeholders (e.g. process owners, process users and clients).

The evaluation tools to be considered for use during the reviews are:

- **Desk Review**: Policy, Manuals and procedures related to the procurement process. Identification of new approaches being implemented in other UN or international organizations. Findings, recommendations and lessons from UNIDO Evaluation reports.

- **Interviews**: to analyze and discuss specific issues/topics with key process stakeholders

- **Survey to stakeholders**: To measure the satisfaction level and collect expectations, issues from process owners, user and clients

- **Process and Stakeholders Mapping**: To understand and identify the main phases the procurement process and sub-processes; and to identify the perspectives and expectations from the different stakeholders, as well as their respective roles and responsibilities

- **Historical Data analysis from IT procurement systems**: To collect empirical data and identify and measure to the extent possible different performance dimensions of the process, such as timeliness, re-works, complaints, ..)

An evaluation matrix is presented in Annex A, presenting the main questions and data sources to be used in the project and country evaluations, as well as the preliminary questions and data sources for the forthcoming thematic evaluation on Procurement in 2015.
**ANNEX A: Evaluation matrix for the procurement process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators$^7$</th>
<th>Data source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Was the procurement timely? How long the procurement process takes (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)</td>
<td>(Overall) Time to Procure (TTP)</td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Procurement related documents review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If no, how long were the times gained or delays. If delay, what was the reason(s)?</td>
<td>Time to Delivery (TTD)</td>
<td>• Interviews with PM, procurement officers and Beneficiaries</td>
<td>• SAP/Infobase (queries related to procurement volumes, categories, timing, issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If no, pleased elaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Was the customs clearance timely? How many days did it take?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How long did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption</td>
<td>Time to Government Clearance (TTGC)</td>
<td>• Interviews with beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?</td>
<td>Level of clarity of roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>• Procurement Manual • Interview with PMs</td>
<td>• Procurement related documents review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^7$ These indicators are preliminary proposed here. They will be further defined and piloted during the Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO procurement process planned for 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• Interview to PMs  
• Interviews with local partners                                                                 |                                                                             |
| Costs                         | - To what extent were suppliers delivering products/services as required?            | - Level of satisfaction with Suppliers                                      | • Interviews with PMs                                                                                         | • Evaluation Reports  
• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.  
• Interviews with Procurement officers                                                   |
| Quality of products           | - Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no, please elaborate | - Costs vs budget                                                         | • Interview with PMs                                                                                         |                                                                             |
| Process / workflow            | - To what extent the process provides adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception…)? | - Level of satisfaction with products/services                              | • Survey to PMs and beneficiaries  
• Observation in project site                                                                 | • Procurement related documents review  
• Evaluation Reports  
• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.  
• Interviews with Procurement officers                                                   |
<p>|                               | - To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity? | - Level of satisfaction with the procurement process                        | • Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries                                             |                                                                             |
|                               | - Which are the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?                | - Level of satisfaction with the procurement process                        | • Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries                                             |                                                                             |
|                               | - Which part(s) of the procurement process can be streamlined or                    | - Level of satisfaction with the procurement process                        | • Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries                                             |                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Data source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simplified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>review&lt;br&gt;• Evaluation Reports&lt;br&gt;• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.&lt;br&gt;• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>