

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2648	
GEF Agency project ID		GFL-2328-2716-4953	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Support for Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Tunisia	
Country/Countries		Tunisia	
Region		MENA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD1/BD-SP6	
Executing agencies involved		General Directorate of Environment and Quality of Life of the Ministry of Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		[one of the beneficiaries; through consultation] Association du Développement Durable, Organisation de Défense des Consommateurs.	
Private sector involvement		[one of the beneficiaries; through consultation] Tunisian Union of Agriculture and Fishing (UTAF); The Tunisian Union of Industry, Commerce and Art craft (UTICA), Office Tunisienne du Commerce (OTC)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		02/08/2006	
Effectiveness date / project start		06/11/2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/2010 (TE,p.5)	
Actual date of project completion		07/21/2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.85 (UNEP+GEF, TE, p.5)	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.92 (Tunisian Government, TE,p.5)	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.85	0.84
Total Co-financing		0.92	0.68 ("Total co-financing realized at 30/06/2014" TE,p.5)
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.77	The TE is vague is specifying the project's financial status by the EOP
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		02/2015	
Author of TE		Giorgio V. Brandolini	
TER completion date		12/23/2015	

TER prepared by	Chenhao Liu
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Molly Watts

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review (TE,p.70-76)	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MU	S ¹	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	Overall Risk (Medium)	MU	HS (Highly Satisfactory)	MU
M&E Design	NR	MS	MS	MS
M&E Implementation	NR	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	S	HS	S
Quality of Execution	NR	S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	MS (TE, p.87)	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

“The overall goal of the project in Tunisia was that the country would have a workable, responsive and transparent NBF (National Biosafety Framework) by 2010, in line with its national development priorities, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and other international obligations.” (TE, p.14)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

“The project objective was to develop the national biosafety capacities required to establish functional, workable and transparent national biosafety frameworks in accordance with national development priorities and international obligations. Specific project objectives included:

- To integrate biosafety into a national development strategy
- To establish and consolidate a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with the CP, national needs and other international obligations.
- To enhance the existing administrative system on biosafety to be competent and efficient in handling requests for applications, including systems for risk assessments, decision-making and administrative processing.
- To strengthen the present national system for public awareness, participation, education and access to information on biosafety

The project has five components:

- A. Biosafety is integrated into the national biotechnology strategy of Tunisia
- B. A fully operational and responsive regulatory regime in line with existing national laws and other international obligations is in place
- C. An efficient national system for handling requests and decision-making is in place

¹ (relevance: HS, effectiveness: S, efficiency S)

- D. An effective national system for follow-up activities, namely monitoring, inspections and enforcement is in place
- E. An active national system for public awareness and participation is in place” (TE, p.14-16)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The project has undergone 12 revisions, most of which are adjustments to work plans but with no change in the GEO and PDO. “The most relevant change in the project implementation with respect to its original design concerns the long delay due to the interruption of activities in the aftermath of the Arab spring.”(TE, p.18) After the long-time delay, the project restructured its theory of change and dropped some planned activities (TE, p.7),

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the project’s strategic relevance as “Moderately Satisfactory”. This TER, following a binary scale (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory), will rate the strategic relevance of the project outcome as “Satisfactory”.

The project is Tunisia’s concrete action in fulfilling its commitment to Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), of which Tunisia is a signatory. (TE,p.7) The project is also consistent with the country’s development priorities. The Government of Tunisia (GoT) formulated the National Strategy on Biological Diversity with GEF financial assistance, and drafted the National policy on biological diversity, which were implemented through a five-year strategic action plan (TE, p .13) The design of this project “recognizes that biosafety concerns – Living modified organisms (LMOs) potential risks and hazards could hamper the benefits of biotechnology innovation – are key to conciliate the country’s strategic commitment to economic development and the conservation and sustainable utilization of the national biological resources.” (TE, p.7) The project belongs to the GEF’s Biodiversity Focal Area and specifically it is relevant to the following area: “(3) Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety”, and is therefore most relevant to the implementation of GEF Operational Programs 1-4 and 13 (TE, p.24)

\

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	------------------------------------------

The TE only provided a summary of the project's outcome achievements, and rated the project's overall outcome effectiveness as "Moderately Unsatisfactory". This TER will also rate the project's outcome effectiveness as "Moderately Unsatisfactory". The project has been successful in working towards realizing its intended targets, but due to the lack of timely approval of relevant laws and regulation by the government, the project's other achievements cannot serve well the project's goals. The TER's rating will be supported by an analysis of relevant information provided by TE and PIR 2014 (As of June 30 2014, one month before the project closure), as per below: (TE, p.26-30); (PIR 2014, p.4-11)

Outcome Component A: Biosafety is integrated into the national biotechnology strategy of Tunisia

Indicator: National Biosafety Strategy published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP (end of project) Target Value: Functional Biosafety Strategy document is in place

Value as of June 30, 2014: A Biosafety Strategy and Action plan was finalized in Arabic and French; a scientific review was completed for the actualization of national biosafety strategy.

EOP status reported by the TE: The draft Biosafety strategic documents was approved by all stakeholders but not by the government yet.

Outcome Component B: A fully operational and responsive regulatory regime in line with the Cartagena Protocol and national needs and priorities is in place

Indicator: Biosafety Law with supporting implementing Decrees and orders published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: Functional Biosafety Law with supporting Decrees and orders is published

Value as of June 30, 2014: Legal texts for the Biosafety Law and implementing regulations/guidelines were finalized in Arabic and French, however the government has not yet adopted the legal texts; draft texts of a Guide on the national regulatory regime for biosafety were developed; a training course on biotechnology & biosafety: regulatory regime, institutional, socioeconomics & ethics was held in May 2010. Subcommittees were created to finalize with the different stakeholders the biosafety Law with supporting implementing, decrees and orders published. A workshop on Legal framework on biosafety for 30 members of the National Committee on Biosafety was organized.

EOP status reported by the TE: The biosafety regulatory regimes instruments and capacities developed have not been operationalized yet.

Outcome Component C: An efficient national system for handling requests, perform risk assessment, testing of GMOs, and decision-making is in place

Indicator 1: Methodologies for undertaking risk assessment & management published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: methodologies for risk assessment & management are published

Value as of June 30, 2014: methodologies for risk assessment & management were finalized in French

Indicator 2: Protocols & operational manuals for Risk Assessment and Risk Management published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: Protocols for Risk Assessment and Management are published and used for handling applications and training

Value as of June 30, 2014: Updated texts on risk assessment and risk management were prepared for stakeholder review and were finalized.

Indicator 3: Statutory Forms for LMO applications published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: Statutory Forms are in use for handling applications

Value as of June 30, 2014: Statutory Forms in French were finalized for stakeholder review, and it was planned to translate these guides into English and Arabic.

EOP status reported by the TE: No decision was taken as the law is still at a draft stage; interim measures are being performed along the existing legal documents.

Outcome Component D: An effective national system for follow-up activities, namely monitoring, inspections and enforcement is in place

Indicator 1: Procedures for monitoring and enforcement established (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: procedures for monitoring and enforcement are published and operational

Value as of June 30, 2014: Updated texts incorporating initial comments were prepared by a consultancy group for further review by parent ministry and relevant stakeholders.

Indicator 2: Training guides for monitoring for environmental effects and inspection published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: Training guides on monitoring and enforcement are in use in training of regulatory agents.

Value as of June 30, 2014: A guide for monitoring and inspection was prepared in Arabic for further stakeholder review; a training course on methods of detection & quantification of GMOs was organized; and a training course for monitoring and inspection was organized.

Indicator 3: Existing laboratories selected and upgraded to handle LMO Detection (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: certified laboratories are established to handle LMO Detection activities

Value as of June 30, 2014: Most of the required equipments were purchased for the laboratories handling LMO Detection; a national network between laboratories (central laboratory for analysis, the technical center for food analysis, the laboratory for seed detection and the gene bank) was created.

EOP status reported by the TE: Monitoring skills and GMO detection capacities are yet to be operationalized due to lack of deployment of the NBF procedures.

Outcome Component E: An active national system for public awareness and participation is in place

Indicator 1: Public awareness, participation and education plan published (pending to be achieved)

EOP Target Value: A strategic plan for public engagement is operational.

Value as of June 30, 2014: A “week of biosafety” events was organized during the last week of May for many NGO; some information dissemination & sensitization among the public was done; consultants will be contracted to develop a strategy or communication plan of public awareness and education in relation with biosafety.

Indicator 2: Training guide for public awareness and participation with clearly defined entry points for public participation (Achieved)

EOP Target Value: Training guide and related materials on public engagement are published

Value as of June 30, 2014: A Booklet and interactive CD on GMOs(Genetically Modified Organisms) were disseminated among students and relevant stakeholders; translation, publishing and dissemination of training guide and related materials for public information and sensitization were done; preparation was in process for the TOR of editing and design of documents related with biosafety in order to elaborate and disseminate outreach material (in three languages Arabic, French and English) for public information and awareness.

Indicator 3: National Biosafety Website published (pending to be fully achieved)

EOP Target Value: A functional biosafety information website is accessible to all stakeholders.

Value as of June 30, 2014: BCH (Biosafety Clearing House) data acquisition and the development of website was ongoing

EOP status reported by the TE: The BCH is not operational yet, and awareness raising has reached a limited target being uninfluential in stimulating investments in biotechnology and decisions on the implementation of the draft Biosafety strategic documents.

From the above analysis, it is clear that although evidence from the PIR suggested a strong potential for a high achievement of project outcomes, the project has not reached its primary goal due to the awaited approval by the government of relevant laws and regulatory measures in order to establish a comprehensive national biosafety regulatory regime (or NBF). Therefore, a rating of “Moderately Unsatisfactory” for the project outcome effectiveness is justified.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the project’s outcome efficiency as “Satisfactory”, and this TER will adopt the same rating. High Level technical skills of participants and effective technical coordination are marked features of this project, but the efficiency was hampered by the delayed political process of decision-making, which are to some extent inevitable due to the “Arabic Spring”.

“The existence of high level technical skills in Tunisia facilitated the deployment of the project activities. Coordination was easily achieved at the technical level, while decision making processes lagged behind. Thus the results achieved in one component didn’t impact on the other ones.” (TE, p.7) However, the long delay induced by the absence of decisions following the Arab spring negatively affected

project efficiency. “Discontinuity at the institutions apex disrupted the political support and appeal for private parties to integrate their action in value chains exploiting the opportunities of complying with the BS (biosafety) regulations in order to enter competitive markets. “ (TE, p.32) The project activities resumed in 2012, after 3 years, with a new work plan designed to complete technical trainings and awareness raising actions by the end of 2014. (TE, p.7) Following the revised work plan, “A National technical commission on biosafety was established to provide continuity to the project results. However, its mandate does not address the administrative and political tasks that should be performed by the National Biosafety Committee, which should assist political and administrative decision making.”(TE, p.7)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	------------------------------------

The TE rated the project’s sustainability as “Moderately Unlikely” based on the individual assessment of four sub-categories of sustainability: Financial Sustainability (Moderately Unlikely); Socio-political Sustainability (Moderately Unlikely); Institutional Framework Sustainability (Moderately Unlikely); Environmental Sustainability (Highly Likely). In a same approach, this TER rates the project’s sustainability as “Moderately Unlikely” based on individual assessment of four sub-categories of sustainability. The

project's sustainability is moderately unlikely, as with the current evidence challenges in this regard are more significant than contributors.

Financial Resource Sustainability- Moderately Unlikely

The project's financial sustainability is moderately unlikely. There are some promising financial sources for sustaining the project, but so far they are unsecured, and their realization is also hampered by the incomplete achievement of project outcome of establishing an operational and responsive regulatory biosafety regime at the national level. "The project aimed at developing a systematic and reliable approach to Biosafety management in order to promote the trust of investors, users and other stakeholders in biotechnology innovation. As LMOs (Living Modified Organisms) regulations also concern duties, levies and fees related to authorization and sanctions, the NBF (National Biosafety Framework) has the potential to generate resources for the running and updating of the system. However, no calculation of the financial resources needed was done in the course of the identification of the project. The slow pace of investments in this sector, due to the lack of the legal framework, is preventing the financial benefits of the NBF from materializing." (TE, p.31) "The continuation of project results depends on the commitment of the private sector to experiment with and promote biotechnology innovation. Presently, the resources made available to implement and run the NBF –raised internally from the Government budget -are not adequate for the deployment of a satisfactory monitoring system and for performing the required laboratory GMO detection analyses, should the legal framework be approved and become operational." (TE, p.31)

Socio-political Sustainability- Moderately Unlikely

The project has promising prospects of socio-political sustainability, but so far challenges in this area are more significant. The project was delayed for a few years due to the "Arabic Spring", thus the project's sustainability significantly relies on the political stability of the country, which is unsecured. Technically, the project is in line with the Tunisian government's development goals, in which biotechnology was identified as an instrument for development and strategies were formulated to create a cluster of academic as well as research and development institutions specializing in different areas of biotechnology (TE, p.30). At the same time, the country's impoverishment of agro-biodiversity led to the potential prevalence of LMOs, in the form of imported seed of animal feeding crops, which has already raised concerns among the public regarding the potential side-effects of LMOs. (TE, p.30) These factors provide a sound base of political support to sustain the project. However, although capacities were developed among relevance stakeholders-key institutions, technical bodies, these new capacities can't be put into use temporarily due to the project's incomplete achievement of establishing a legal regime for biosafety. (TE, p.30) In the words of the TE, "the sustainability of the project results is challenged at its roots by such legal and institutional vacuum." (TE, p.30)

Institutional Sustainability- Unable to Assess

The most significant pillar of the project outcomes is the establishment and implementation of NBF (National Biodiversity Framework). Under this framework, technical bodies and institutions will

collaborate to ensure the country's biosafety. However, before the formal establishment of this NBF, the strength of institutional arrangements under the NBF cannot be assessed. According to the TE, "The implementation of the NBF and enactment of the relevant policies and regulations are expected to exploit scientific, technical and administrative capacities being built in the beneficiary institutions. The DGEQV, as the BS focal point, coordinates the Government technical bodies contributing to the running of the NBF. The national technical commission on Biosafety –in absence of the Biosafety Committee -is expected to advise the MoE and other Ministries in taking decisions on Biosafety. Coordination at the decision making level was not directly addressed by the project and the non-approval of the legal framework curtailed the influence of the DGEQV on the regulation of this sector. The effectiveness of these bodies to make the institutional arrangements effective has to be tested once the NBF becomes operational." (TE, p.32)

Environmental Sustainability- Likely

The environmental impact established through this project will be long-lasting. Although incomplete in its achievement, the project has initiated and significantly pushed forward the process of establishment of the National Biodiversity Framework, which will govern the country's long-term activities related to biosafety. Also, the project has successfully raised the public awareness and enhanced the technical capacities among relevant technical bodies, which will pave the way for sustainability of the project as well as its environmental impact established up to present.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

"The Tunisian government's co-financing amounted to US\$ 919,260 (US\$ 78,000 in cash, the rest in kind)." (TE, p.17) The final co-financing realized is "\$681,095 (at 30/06/2014)" (TE, p.5), which indicates a materialization rate of 74%. "The contributions from the government of Tunisia were stopped because of the national institutional changes associated to the Arab spring. Expenditure of co-financing- in kind but equivalent to US\$ 78,000 - created some inconveniences such as the loss of trained staff and budgetary constraints."(TE, p.17) But the underachievement of the project outcome is not clearly linked to the lack of co-financing based on evidence currently available from relevant policy documents. It is therefore not possible to assess the effect of lower than expected co-financing on project outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Due to the "Arab Spring", the project was delayed for three and a half years. "Long interruption in decision making in the aftermath of the "Arab spring" resulted in the dropping of some of the planned activities (which is also caused by "Some delay in the disbursement of UNEP/GEF funds" TE, p.35) and also caused

delays and replanning in the execution of activities.” (TE, p.8) “Institutional changes (led by the “Arab Spring) delayed the project execution until a new institutional and economic context emerged, which turned out to be less favorable to the NBF implementation. “(TE, p.37) The project’s efficiency was negatively impacted by changes in institutions and the economic development context (TE, p.40) and “the project catalytic role has been jeopardized by the long delay in its implementation.” (TE, p.32)

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE had a single paragraph discussing the country ownership and drivenness, and with current evidence the country ownership /drivenness is not at a high level. “The project was strongly supported by research institutions while the private economic sector and general public were little involved in this initiative. This lack of ownership impacted negatively on the institutions that didn’t fully take responsibility for its implementation. The change in leadership and political instability also affected the level of country ownership and drivenness. Relevant institutions contributed to the deployment of technical resources to perform project activities, but were less committed to direct the project to the achievement of its development objective: implementing a NBF ensuring the reliable release / introduction of LMO to foster the economic development of Tunisia.” (TE, p.35)

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as “Moderately Satisfactory”. This TER will adopt the same rating. The project’s M&E design at entry was comprehensive and specific, but with certain shortcomings in the indicators as pointed out by the TE.

The project’s M&E design is comprehensive. Built upon the project’s Logframe, it set up mechanism for periodic reporting, and includes a MTR (Mid-Term Review), TE (Terminal Evaluation), and Financial Audits. “The UNEP task manager and steering committee were in charge of reporting and hence of the monitoring function. The project did not allocate any specific budget line to implement the M&E plan, which is linked to the fact that UNEP did not require GEF 3 projects to budget for monitoring and evaluation. Thus, no specific resources were available to survey and collect the indicators, but the

UNEP Task manager reported on the accomplishment of activities and their immediate objectives. The project allocated resources for the final evaluation from the technical support budget.” (TE, 36)

“63 indicators are listed in the Logframe (annex 1A), both internal and external, sometimes lacking a numeric target. “ (TE, p.36) The indicators are in line with the SMART principle. For example, in measuring the output component C “to establish and consolidate a functional national system for handling request, perform risk assessment, testing of GMOs, decision-making and performing administrative tasks”, the “Number of decisions made as a result of request within CP timeframe during project life” was selected as an indicator. (TE, p.29) But the TE also reported that, “As a whole, the extremely long list and description of indicators and risks concentrate on the immediate output of the action and do not provide a synthesis assessment of the project progress toward its overall objective.” (TE, p.36)

“Baseline data were included in the table: Logframe on Project against Key Performance Indicators, and Baseline and Methods of Data Collection (Annex 1C) of the project document. They are mostly qualitative and related to the execution of the project activities and their immediate impact.” (TE, p.36)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------

The TE rated two areas related to the M&E implementation: M&E Plan Implementation (Moderately Satisfactory) Budgeting and funding for M&E activities (Satisfactory). This TER will rate the project’s M&E Implementation as “Moderately Satisfactory”. The M&E implementation was smooth and successful, but with some shortcomings.

Evidence from the PIRs (Program Implementation Report) 2011, 2013 and 2014 shows that, each of the project’s outcome components is monitored through comparing the present value with the baseline, MTR target value and EOP target value, along with a progress rating. The MTR assessed the progress made towards the middle of the project, rendered a revised work plan and a number of recommendations. The Terminal Evaluation is thorough, internally consistent, and the evidence presented is convincing. This is in line with a generally positive comment of the TE on the M&E implementation: “The arrangements for monitoring the project outputs and outcomes coincided with the activities reporting process. Data collection procedures are defined in the project document baseline data annex” (TE, p.36) “Evaluation arrangements consisted in the execution of an internal Midterm review by the UNEP Task manager and the external Terminal evaluation by the UNEP Evaluation office. The Midterm report was uploaded in Anubis website. The Evaluation office unit will track the implementation of recommendations at 6 months intervals.”(TE, p.36) However, the TE pointed out one marked shortcoming of the M&E implementation is that the M&E implementation is “limited to the reporting of the project activities execution with little concern for the collection of indicators (external to the project)”(TE, p.41) : “No resources were available for surveys and data collections external to the project. No timeframe or grid for the logframe information collection was included in the work plan.” (TE, p.36)

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the following area related to the quality of project implementation: UNEP supervision and backstopping (Satisfactory). The project's implementing agency is the UNEP. Considering the UNEP's successful performance as the implementing agency, this TER will rate the quality of project implementation as "Satisfactory".

According to the TE "Project supervision was ensured by the participation of UNEP and national coordinators in the Steering Committee. No major problems were faced in the exchange of information. Local partners action consisted in the execution of tasks assigned by the Executing agency, in most cases the participation to workshops, training and collaboration in drafting technical (the guidelines) and administrative (the regulations) documents. UNEP backstopping through the Biosafety unit consisted in the supply of technical advice (e.g., in the case of the technical appraisal of laboratory equipment) and monitoring of the execution of the activities. Monitoring concentrated on reporting on the delivery of activities. The project reporting was structured along UNEP procedures and produced information adequate to highlight the achievements and milestones of the project execution. The Anubis system provided an adequate filing and dissemination mechanism for reporting project activities." (TE, p.35)

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated two areas related to the project's execution: i. Project implementation and management (Satisfactory) ii. Financial planning and management (Satisfactory). Considering the successful practice of project execution and the performance of the project's executing agency, this TER will rate the quality of project execution as "Satisfactory".

The project's executing agency is General Directorate of Environment and Quality of Life of the Ministry of Environment (DGEQV). According to the TE, "the implementation of the project activities was relatively smooth as it consisted in the national executing agency executing centralized activities and spending the GEF cash contribution along UNEP financial procedures. The national executing agency coordinated the

partners and implemented the project work plan. Local partners action consisted in the execution of tasks assigned by the national Executing Agency, in most cases the participation in workshops, training and collaboration in drafting technical (the guidelines) and administrative (the regulations) documents.” (TE, p.34)

Considering the project’s financial management, “the project adopted UNEP/GEF financial standards. The national Executing Agency (DGEQV) was in charge of the approval of expenditures, while the ANPE, an agency of the Ministry of Environment with greater financial flexibility, was in charge of their disbursement. Updated budgets were regularly uploaded in the Anubis database. Some delay in the disbursement of UNEP/GEF funds and the greater one due to the interruption of the project resulted in the dropping of some activities. The project budget was composed of the contributions from GEF-UNEP and the Tunisian government, amounting respectively to 48% and 52% of the total (see Annex 5.2). By June 30, 2014, the actual expenditure of GEF-UNEP contribution amounted to 99% of the planned expenditure, those of the Tunisian Government’ in kind contribution reached 74% (see Annex 5.2). The completion of the project execution is expected by the end of 2014.” (TE, p.35)

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project mainly focuses on constructing a national-level legal and institutional regime of biosafety. As this goal was still incomplete by the EOP, the project didn’t lead to any direct environmental change.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project mainly focuses on constructing a national-level legal and institutional regime of biosafety. As this goal was still incomplete by the EOP, the project didn’t lead to any direct socio-economic change.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

One component of the project activities is capacity building for biosafety among the public. The TE didn't directly report any changes in capacities, but changes can be inferred from the following relevant activities/achievements established through the project: (TE, p.28-30)

- establishment of BCH (Biosafety Clearing House) is in process: data acquisition and the development of website on biosafety is ongoing; 3 meetings were held with government and main stakeholders to collect views and identify main elements of a biotech/biosafety strategy ; training courses were carried out on Biotechnology & biosafety: regulatory regime, institutional, socioeconomics & ethics (2010); an interactive CD and booklet on GMO was published and disseminated among students and stakeholders; training guide on public information and participation drafted; a “Biosafety week” was organized to inform and make aware NGO and other stakeholders (2013); the communication and public awareness committee was created; workshop was organized on Legal framework on biosafety for 30 members of the National Committee
- training courses on (1) methods of detection & quantification of GMOs and (2) monitoring and inspection were conducted.

b) Governance

The project has mainly concentrated on establishing the national biosafety regime- National Biosafety Framework (NBF), and it led to the following changes/impending changes in governance:

- Biosafety strategy and action plan document were developed and elaborated in French and Arabic.
- Biosafety regulatory regime documents (2 draft laws, 3 draft decrees and 3 draft orders) were elaborated; revision and translation (in English and Arabic) was finished for all technical guides on risk assessment, risk management, risk communication, notification request and authorization requests. The National Technical Committee of Biosafety and 3 subcommittees (legal framework, laboratories for GMO detection and quantification, communication, sensitization and public participation) was established to follow up the project results.
- Methodologies for risk assessment and management of LMOs were developed; statutory forms for applications or requests were drafted; operational manuals for handling requests were developed; methodologies for monitoring of environmental effects of LMOs were drafted; 2 procedures and forms for enforcement actions required with handling, transport, use, transit and release of LMOs were drafted; Guide for monitoring and inspection was prepared in Arabic; most of the required

equipment were purchased for the laboratories handling LMO detection and a national network between laboratories was created. A draft database was developed in synergy with BCH project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

Neither the TE nor the project documents identified any unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

As the NBF is yet to be established, coupled with a number of technical constraints, no replication/scale-up has been in place yet. (TE, p.32)

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE summarized the following lessons learned: (TE, p.9)

- “A policy gap analysis has to be performed in order to systematically appraise the current situation, map the interests at stake in biotechnology innovation, help focus the debate, provide background documents concerning the implementation of the NBF and to identify challenges ahead in economic development and natural resources conservation.
- In order to achieve the participation of higher institutional level stakeholders – typically policy makers – the implementation of the NBF has to be integrated into national and regional economic governance related initiatives (building of local authorities’ skills, integration of regional market).”

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations: (TE, p.10)

- “The Biosafety focal point should explore new ways to stimulate biotechnology innovation and strengthen the Biosafety approach with representatives of the private sector. The Ministry of Trade’s current work on a Biotechnology Strategy has to be exploited for stimulating the interest of the private sector in the implementation of the NBF. Presentations on the Biosafety framework have to be

developed by the DGEQV in collaboration with representatives of key economic development sectors (e.g., food industry, seed, environmental friendly chemical products, etc.) to present in a targeted way the opportunities and challenges of mainstreaming biosafety in economic development.

- The National Technical Commission on biosafety should establish a Steering Committee in charge of planning activities and to assist the BS focal point to communicate with institutions and stakeholders taking decisions on biotech/biosafety issues.
- The completion of the project activities has to be integrated with the elaboration of the project exit strategy, in order to ensure that the three areas of interest (legal framework, laboratories and accreditation, awareness raising) converge to provide a road map to decision makers on priority actions. This activity has to be led by the biosafety focal point, in collaboration with the National technical commission on biosafety.”

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE didn't provide a detailed list of project's outcome achievement by component, but it provided some relevant information and an incomprehensive summary	Moderately Unsatisfactory
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent, the evidence presented complete convincing, and ratings well substantiated	Satisfactory
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE has thoroughly examined and discussed the project's sustainability, it mentioned the lack of project exit strategy (in its recommendation)	Satisfactory
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The "Lessons Learned" section is relevant and concise	Moderately Satisfactory
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE listed the detailed the project cost (total and per activity), and information on co-financing reparation, but it didn't specify the actual co-financing used.	Moderately Satisfactory
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE's assessment of the project's M&E system is adequate	Satisfactory
		Moderately Satisfactory

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD.