

**OUTCOME EVALUATION REPORT**

**UNDP Saudi Arabia Country Programme Document 2012-2016 Outcome 3. Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy**

Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic

December 2016

Table of Contents

[Abbreviations 3](#_Toc470022214)

[Executive Summary 4](#_Toc470022215)

[1. INTRODUCTION 7](#_Toc470022216)

[1.1 Aims of the Evaluation 7](#_Toc470022217)

[1.2 Context of the Outcome 3 8](#_Toc470022218)

[1.3 Evaluation Methodology 11](#_Toc470022219)

[1.4 Evaluation Design 12](#_Toc470022220)

[1.5 Evaluation Limitations and mitigation measures 13](#_Toc470022221)

[2. Context of the Country Programme (2012-2016) 14](#_Toc470022222)

[3. Key findings 16](#_Toc470022223)

[3.1 Relevance of the Intended Outcome and related outputs 16](#_Toc470022224)

[3.2 Efficiency 18](#_Toc470022225)

[3.3 Effectiveness: Progress towards Achievement of the Outcome 21](#_Toc470022226)

[3.4 Impact: Status of the Outcome 3: Sustainable Development mainstreamed in Economy 26](#_Toc470022227)

[3.4.1 UNDP Contributions to the Outcome 3 26](#_Toc470022228)

[3.5 Factors Influencing UNDP Contribution to the Outcome 27](#_Toc470022229)

[3.6 Sustainability 30](#_Toc470022230)

[4. Conclusions 31](#_Toc470022231)

[5. Recommendations 32](#_Toc470022232)

[Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix 35](#_Toc470022233)

[Annex 2. Terms of Reference 42](#_Toc470022234)

[Annex 3. List of Reviewed documents 60](#_Toc470022235)

[Annex 4. List of interviewed persons 62](#_Toc470022236)

[Annex 5. Overview of budget allocations 63](#_Toc470022237)

**TABLE OF FIGURES**

Table 1: CPD results and resources framework 6

Table 2: Revised Outcome indicator 8

Table 3: Projects implemented during the period 2012–2016: Outcome 3: Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy 9

Table 4: Limitations and constraints of the evaluation and corresponding mitigation measures 11

Table 5: Recommendations 30

Graph 1: Overview of budget allocations 17

Graph 2: Trends in Saudi Arabia’s HDI component indices 1990-2014 24

# Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ACARA | Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority |
| ADA | Arriyadh Development Authority |
| ARAMCO | Saudi Arabian Oil Company |
| CITC | Communications & Information Technology Commission |
| CO | Country Office |
| CPD | Country Programme Document |
| CSR | Corporate Social Responsibility |
| DESA | United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs |
| ESCWA | United Nations Economic and Social Commission for West Asia |
| HDI | Human Development Index |
| HDR | Human Development Report |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| IT | Informational Technology |
| ITU | International Telecommunication Union |
| KACST | National Open Source Software Resources Center |
| KSA | Kingdom of Saudi Arabia |
| KPI | Key Performance Indicator |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goals |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MoE | Ministry of Education |
| MoEP | Ministry of Economy and Planning |
| MoFA | Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| MoTC | Ministry of Transport and Communications |
| NHDR | National Human Development Report |
| NPD | National Planning Document |
| NSDS | National Statistical Development Strategy |
| NSS | National Spatial Strategy |
| NTP | National Transformation Plan |
| NTS | National Transport Strategy |
| OECD DAC | Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PEEC | Public Education Evaluation Commission |
| ROAR | Results Oriented Annual Report |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SCTA | Supreme Commission for Tourism and Antiquities |
| SCTH | Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage |
| SME | Small and medium enterprise |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNCCSF | United Nations Common Country Strategic Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEG | United National Evaluation Group |
| UNWTO | United Nations World Tourism Organization |
| USDA | United States Department of Agriculture |
| WTO | World Trade Organisation |

# 

# Executive Summary

**INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is a high-income country with a per capita GDP of US$ 17,819 and total GDP of US$ 752 billion in 2014. Its development has been steered by the National Development Plans, and more recently Saudi Vision 2030. During the period of 2012-2016, Saudi Arabia has been facing many challenges, including diversifying the economy; building Saudi human capacities to lead and participate in the new industrial and service sectors, towards decreasing reliance on oil based economy and foreign workers. Other challenges were linked to the need to translate more effectively national policies into human development gains through improved governance and public administration as well as developing capacities to ensure that growth proceeds with equity.

UNDP has been deeply engaged in enhancing national capacities in a number of areas, manifested by the support to the mainstreaming sustainable development across economy, through interventions for enhancing *Capacities for Development Planning and Public Administration* and for *Development of a Knowledge Economy*.

UNDP technical assistance interventions have been carried out in the areas of, inter alia, enhancing capacities for Development Planning and Public Administration for results based management and monitoring of NPD results through evidence-based indicator systems at national and local levels; support to strategies in the areas of urban and spatial planning, transport, economic governance, food safety, education, etc. The framework for UNDP interventions is provided through the UNDP Country Programme Document 2012-2016, and its Outcomes. The focus for this Evaluation is on Outcome 3: Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy and its portfolio of projects as follows:

* Advisory Services to Ministry of Foreign Affairs
* Support to Municipal Elections and Post Elections
* Umbrella Programme for Tourism
* Sustainable Road and Transport Management
* Sustainable Development Policy and Planning
* Riyadh Urban Observatory
* Support SFDA second strategic plan implementation
* Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning
* Advisory Services to Saudi CITC
* Capacity Development for Gen. Commission for Survey
* Public Education Evaluation
* Urban Planning and Management
* National Open Source Software Resources Center - KACST

**EVALUATION PURPOSE, PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY**

This Outcome evaluation covers the Outcome 3: Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy and its portfolio of projects implemented within the period of 2012-2016. As per the ToR, the evaluation key objective was to assess how UNDP’s programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially around sustainable development. The purpose of the evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to improve on the current and new UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the next programming cycle (2017-2021). The Outcome evaluation was conducted utilising the five standard Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability) with special focus on analysis of Outcome status and UNDP’s contribution to mainstreaming sustainable development in economy. Evaluator developed evaluation matrix elaborating indicators for each evaluation question required by the ToR. This allowed for presenting the overarching framework for assessment of UNDP contributions to Outcome 3 of the UNDP CPD 2012-2016.

Main data collection tools were semi-structured interviews, group discussions, and review of a wide array of relevant documents. Triangulation was applied to ensure validity of data and to synthesize information derived from different data sources. The evaluation was structured into three key phases: Inception and desk review (November 2016), Field mission/validation in Kenya (November 2016), and Synthesis (November - December 2016).

FINDINGS

**Interventions within Outcome 3 of the UNDP CPD were aligned with main elements of the development policies of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), including the 9th National Development Plan, National Transformation Plan and the Saudi Vision 2030.** The provided support responded to the needs of the transport section, the needs deriving from the economic planning process, spatial and urban planning, food safety, tourism, and the needs for development of educational policies.

UNDP in partnership with KSA Government tackling a variety of sectors and thematic areas, some of which do not directly relate to the Outcome 3. UNDP support was created as a demand-driven technical assistance with set of interventions established to assist the KSA institutions in their reform processes. This approach was praised by the governmental counterparts. The objectives and scope of interventions were coherent with the main elements of the UNDP programme for KSA and in line with the UNDP’s strategic objectives in-country and globally.

**UNDP human and financial resources were to a satisfactory extent adequate to develop required deliverables of the implemented activities and to facilitate contribution to set Outcome in a timely manner.** The resources’ allocation sufficiently considered the demand-driven nature of the interventions. Projects administered a large pool of external experts, with project management located in beneficiary institutions. Real time monitoring and reporting has been identified as an area with a strong need for improvement. Lack of systematic monitoring and evaluation framework is the single most important weakness of the UNDP intervention in KSA. Majority of the projects are long term interventions, and due to this project documents often fail to reflect subsequent changes in projects in updated logframes or Project Documents, which made challenging to track projects’ results within the evaluation process.

**Projects contributing to Outcome 3 have been effective.** UNDP support to government has contributed to increasing institutional and policy capacities of partner government institutions, through investment in skills, linkages, building expertise and new models across the board of UNDP projects and programmes. The evaluation found evidence of new mechanisms and models integrated in policies and institutional structures of partner institutions in sectors of transport, food and drug safety, tourism, education, urban, economic and sustainable development planning. With regards to evidence based policy and reporting, UNDP interventions contributed to enhanced capacities of KSA government to develop Key Performance Indicators of growth and economic development, which marked an investment in building evidence based policy making and adequate analysis of developmental policies adopted by the government. UNDP value added is primarily in its flexibility and responsiveness to the needs. UNDP is able to respond in very short term to requests for expertise for different institutions and thematic areas. UNDP ‘hat’ facilitates links and partnerships between the KSA government and international actors.

**Results achieved within the portfolio of projects are contributing to increasing the mainstreaming of sustainable development in economy.** Review of data for progress to achievement of the CPD outcome indicator - Increase in HDI shows an increase of HDI from 0.77 in 2012 to 0.873 as of end of 2015, placing the country in the very high human development category and positioning it at 39 out of 188 countries and territories. UNDP’s contribution has yielded results particularly for development planning and measuring results through investments in improvement of policies and performance indicators and reporting mechanisms. Results have also been yielded in expanding the institutional capacities of different agencies and institutions to reach safe and improved access to healthy food, transport and urban management services. While policies and strategies mainstream sustainable development to a greater degree formally, challenges remain for substantial realization of sustainable development in practice through full implementation of these policies.

**Sustainability**

**Results have mixed sustainability prospects.** Although the current strategic framework is supportive for further development and expansion of programmes and approaches, there are institutional capacity constraints that may influence continuation of reforms. Also, policies are not designed in participatory manner, which diminishes the potential for holistic approach to reforms and thus their full alliance with the needs of government and population. Increased capacities, models and mechanisms developed by the UNDP interventions provide a good basis for further capacity building and quality assurance activities. Their application is dependent on stability of staffing in institutions and continued institutional memory of institutions.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Strategic recommendations**

**S1** Promote coordination and participatory policy planning and monitoring

**S2** Integrate social, spatial and environmental impact assessment in policy and master planning

**S3** Mainstream gender and human rights approach in programming of UNDP support and advocate for gender mainstreaming across government policies

**Operational Recommendations**

**O1** Develop clear exit strategies for UNDP’s interventions.

**O2** Invest efforts to better integrate UNDP interventions towards ensuring holistic approach to sustainable development.

**O3** Develop Institutional knowledge management plan

**O4** Develop Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system for UNDP interventions in KSA

**O5** Conduct Meta Evaluation of UNDP’s work in KSA

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 

## 1.1 Aims of the Evaluation

Evaluation Expert has been commissioned to undertake the evaluation of UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) Outcome 3: Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy. The Outcome 3 of the Country Programme document refers to support to mainstreaming sustainable development across economy, that encompasses interventions for enhancing *Capacities for Development Planning and Public Administration* and for *Development of a Knowledge Economy*. The cooperation within interventions for enhancing capacities for Development Planning and Public Administration focuses on enhancing institutional capacities for results based management and monitoring of NPD results through evidence-based indicator systems at national and local levels including MDG Reports, NHDRs and National and Local Urban Observatory systems. Also, these include support to strategies such as National Spatial Strategy for regional balance and specialization, and National Rural Development Strategy for connecting communities to services. Further, development of capacities for global partnerships and mechanisms such as MDG review processes and sharing KSAs development successes with other countries through UN and related conferences and for was supported.

Support to development of knowledge economy focused on diversification of the economy beyond oil exports, with major emphasis on growth of a knowledge economy. Support was also provided to building new capacities for expansion of areas of new emphasis like tourism and information technology as well as policies and institutional capacities for shifting to a knowledge economy including the role of New Economic Cities. Related to this has also been support to WTO post-accession policies and improving competitiveness of KSA, and alignment with global standards and safety in areas like transport and food and drug manufacturing. Support has also been invested in building capacities to engage in global partnerships related to above issues of trade and investment.

The indicative resources for Outcome 3 as per the CPD were 20 Million USD, entire amount from other sources. The donor contributing to implementation of the Outcome 3 for the period of 2012-2016 was the Government of Saudi Arabia. All programme development is undertaken with Government and programmes are implemented via National Implementation modality.

As outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the **overall objective** of the outcome evaluation is to assess how UNDP’s programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially around sustainable development. The purpose of the evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to improve on the current and new UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the next programming cycle (2017-2021). The evaluation should highlight the impact, efficiency, effectiveness and suitability of achievements. The findings and recommendations of the outcome evaluation offer analytical insight in why outcome is or is not being achieved in Saudi Arabia’s context and the role UNDP has played. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development. Outcome evaluation also should be able to answer whether UNDP supported the Government of Saudi Arabia in meeting the 9th National Development Plans and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

To respond to the requirements of the Evaluation, a careful methodology for the Evaluation is devised to provide an opportunity to both look at what progress has so far been achieved and understand how to improve and build on elements for further programming.

## 1.2 Context of the Outcome 3

Outcome 3 is integral part of the UNDP Country Strategy paper and goes in line with the United Nations Common Country Strategic Framework (UNCCSF), governing all UN organizations in KSA, particularly results/outcomes relating to Inclusive Growth and Employment: Expanding non-oil growth opportunities and addressing those marginalized in the workforce - youth, women and migrant workers; and Social Protection and Services: Enhanced quality of education, health, social services. It is also part of the UNDP Global Strategic Plan, whose ‘focus areas’ highlight poverty reduction and the achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

As per the UNDP CPD, the Outcome 3 statement is *Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy. In the CPD, the Outcome 3 envisaged the results and resources framework as presented in Table 1 below.*

Table 1: CPD results and resources framework

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL:** NDP Objective 3 Sustainable Economic Development; Objective 4 Balanced regional development; Objective 7 Economic Diversification; Objective 8 Knowledge Economy. **UN COUNTY COOPERATION STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (UNCCSF) OUTCOME #1: Inclusive Growth and Employment, #3 Governance. COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME #3:** Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy. **Outcome indicator:** increase in HDI; % share GDP from non-oil sectors; % share GDP from knowledge sectors; % share GDP from private sector-led growth. **Related UNDP Global Strategic Plan focus areas:** Poverty Reduction and Achievement of MDGs. Democratic Governance | | | | |
| **NATIONAL PARTNER CONTRIBUTION** | **UNDP CONTRIBUTION** | **OTHER PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATOR(S), BASELINES AND TARGET(S) FOR UNDP CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATIVE COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS** |
| Ministry of Planning progress reports on NDP, consultations for NMDGR, NHDR. Ministry Municipality coordinates Spatial Strategy, observatory network, Rural Dev. Strategy. Tourism Agency sets policies for tourism development. Ministry Commerce policies for trade diversification. Investment Agency plans for economic cities. Government IT sector plans/policies. | UNDP advice for NHDR, NMDGR. UNDP capacity support for statistical systems and 9th NDP M&E. UNDP policy advice to 10th NDP and related policies. UNDP advice for design of NSS, RDS, capacity development for cultural heritage, eco-tourism. UNDP advice for trade and investment. | Chambers of Commerce and industry support diversification policies. DESA, ESCWA, WTO, UNWTO for global expertise. KACST supports development of IT sector innovations like open source software capacities. Global partnerships will be engaged to share experiences among countries. | **Indicator:** HD approach integrated in development policies.  **Baseline:** Trend towards making human development at centre of national development paradigm. **Target:** Clear HD oriented approach to development policy by 2015 with view to sustainability of development results.  **Indicator:** Global best practices integrated into new Spatial Strategy, Rural Strategy, Urban Observatory policies.  **Baseline:** Modest ability of previous strategies to achieve results in geographic balance of development.  **Target:** Strategies serve as effective frameworks for balanced development  **Indicator:** Sustainability integrated in trade, investment, tourism policies.  **Baseline:** Modest trend towards economic diversification beyond oil.  **Target:**  New strategies and capacities accelerate diversification beyond oil export economy. | 9th NDP annual reports. NHDR. NMDGR. 10th NDP  Spatial Strategy. Rural Strategy. Urban Observatory. Network.  Policies, institution capacities for eco-tourism, cultural heritage.  World Trade Service Center. New CSR and investment policies. |
|

During the implementation of the 2012-2016 CPD, it became clear that the indicators set for Outcome 3 were very general and not SMART[[1]](#footnote-1), UNDP Country Team proposed new indicator to be used for measuring the Outcome 3 (See Table 2). This new framework was adopted and used in monitoring the progress of Outcome since 2014 – and this evaluation adopts this indicator as relevant for the assessment of Outcome 3.

Table 2: Revised Outcome indicator

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME #3** | **Outcome indicator** | Baseline 2012 |
| Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy.**:** increase in HDI; % share GDP from non-oil sectors; % share GDP from knowledge sectors; % share GDP from private sector-led growth. | *Increase in HDI* | Development policies without strong HD focus  Current HDI 0.77  77.1% share GDP from non-oil sectors (including services) |

As presented in the Table 1 above, the Outcome 3 is further specified through Outputs, which should provide more elaborate understanding of what UNDP provides through its interventions. Some of these outputs (e.g. *CSR, Rural strategy, World Trade Service Centre, policies, institution capacities for eco-tourism*) have not been tackled by UNDP interventions due to lack of projects focusing on these areas (See Table 3 below). Review of CPD outputs and projects implemented within the Outcome 3 shows the necessity to refine the output definition for the purpose of this evaluation to enable more comprehensive analysis of UNDP achievements in support to Outcome 3. Therefore, the proposed refined outputs, agreed with UNDP, are the following:

Box 1: Refined Outputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outputs to be used for the Evaluation** | **Outputs as stated within the CPD[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| **OUTPUT 1.** Government policy and institutional capacities improved in the areas of transport, safety, tourism, education, urban, economic and sustainable development planning | 10th NDP; 9th Spatial Strategy; Rural Strategy; Urban Observatory, Network |
| **OUTPUT 2.** Government reporting improved by improved quality of Key performance indicators and systematic data collection and analysis | NHDR; NMDGR; NDP annual reports |

Majority of interventions implemented within the Outcome 3 were segments of long term engagement with government, in some areas lasting for more than 30 years (e.g. Ministry of Transport). Some others have been relatively new, such as the cooperation with the Saudi Food and Drugs Authority. The overview of project implemented in the period between late 2012 and 2016 within the Outcome 3 is presented in Table 3 below. Four projects from this list are not reviewed within the scope of this evaluation, namely: “National Open Source Software Resources Center - KACST” and “Advisory Services to Ministry of Foreign Affairs”, “Advisory Services to Saudi CITC”, and “Support to Municipal Elections and Post Elections”. These projects were not reviewed because their implementation did not provide extensive direct contribution to the Outcome.

Table 3: Projects implemented during the period 2012–2016: Outcome 3: Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Title | Period |
| 1 | Advisory Services to Ministry of Foreign Affairs | 2010-2017 |
| 2 | Support to Municipal Elections and Post Elections | 2004-2016 |
| 3 | Umbrella Programme for Tourism | 2012-2017 |
| 4 | Sustainable Road and Transport Management | 2012-2016 |
| 5 | Sustainable Development Policy and Planning | 2015-2017 |
| 6 | Riyadh Urban Observatory | 2015-2017 |
| 7 | Support SFDA second strategic plan implementation | 2013-2014 |
| 8 | Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning | 2013-2016 |
| 9 | Advisory Services to Saudi CITC | 2014-2016 |
| 10 | Capacity Development for Gen. Commission for Survey | 2014-2017 |
| 11 | Public Education Evaluation | 2014-2016 |
| 12 | Urban Planning and Management | 2015-2017 |
| 13 | National Open Source Software Resources Center - KACST | 2011-2015 |

## 

## 1.3 Evaluation Methodology

The methodology for the Evaluation is in line with the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards as well as the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results approved by UNEG in evaluation process.

As outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the evaluation focused on the following:

**Outcome status***:* Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcome 3 achievement, and identify the challenges to attainment of the outcome. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcome.

**Underlying factors***:* Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcome. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

**Strategic Positioning of UNDP**: Examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP’s inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a current and potential partner. The Country Office (CO) position will be analyzed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP's relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating value by responding to partners' needs.

**Partnership strategy***:* Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership building efforts has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders’ participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the outcome to the country’s needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in development.

**Lessons learned**: Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in incubation, and in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve the related outcome. This will support learning lessons about UNDP’s contribution to the outcomes over the CPD cycle to design a better assistance strategy for the new programming cycle.

## 1.4 Evaluation Design

The evaluation has been participatory, engaging UNDP and the implementing partners from the government to assist determining and refining the most important evaluation questions, the answers to which would help provide UNDP and the implementing partners with valuable recommendations for future programmes working towards further support to the sustainable development and achievement of SDGs, targeting economic policy development and its implementation at the national and sub-national levels in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The evaluation was carried out in three phases:

* The inception phase and the document review;
* The validation phase comprising interviews with government stakeholders and other relevant actors.
* Analysis and report writing phase. This phase was marked by two main points of consultation, the field work de-briefing meeting with the UNDP team, and the final presentation of the report.

During the Inception phase and the document review, the Evaluator developed the Evaluation Matrix as a guide for the evaluation (See Annex 1). Evaluation Questions, outlined in the ToR, formed the basis for Evaluation Matrix.

Qualitative data was collected by using several methods including:

* **A critical desk review of materials related to the Outcome**, as well as any material that is provided by UNDP such as projects’ reports and annual work plans, data on achievement of performance indicators, etc. This review also extended to documents external to the UNDP that are identified by the consultant through own research or through informants, which have a bearing on the evaluation questions. The Evaluator conduct a comprehensive review of historical information and reports pertaining to the Outcome 3 since its inception, and earlier, as necessary. This information was analysed and the results were tailored to answer the main evaluation questions outlined in the ToR.
* **Interviews with UNDP team**.
* **In-depth, semi-structured interviews** with representatives from the government counterparts. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as a more appropriate and valuable technique, because they will allow partners to present and explain points freely. Purpose of in-depth interviews was to familiarise and assess the use of UNDP delivered outputs, be it a government institution or other actors.
* **In-depth interviews with a variety of representatives of the beneficiaries and partners** (e.g. Ministries, Authorities, Councils supported, consultants, etc.)

**Quantitative** data collection methods will consist of:

* Review of data sourced from the interventions on indicators related to the Outcome 3
* Collection and review of secondary data from the analysis of the strategic framework, including but not limited to the Ninth National Development Plan (2009–2014), the National Transformation Plan (NTP) 2020, Vision 2030, etc.
* Review of data from other secondary sources.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis was guided by the Evaluation matrix developed during the inception phase of the evaluation process (See Annex 1). To ensure that findings and related conclusions are objective and evidence based, triangulation was used to identify inconsistencies and ensure reliability. Also, the Evaluator used both the descriptive statistic but also more advanced analytical exercises such as measures of correlation to strengthen the evidence base for findings and conclusions.

## 1.5 Evaluation Limitations and mitigation measures

The following section and table discusses the main limitation and constraints encountered by the evaluator during the implementation of the evaluation.

Table 4: Limitations and constraints of the evaluation and corresponding mitigation measures

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Limitations | Responses |
| Many stakeholders from the government were not available for interviews during the field visit | UNDP informed stakeholders as early as possible of the upcoming visit and asked for their collaboration. |
| Lack of consistent monitoring and other relevant project performance data | Evaluator, in cooperation with UNDP, sought to gather as much information and possible from different sources (interviews, primary and secondary documentary sources) on outputs and outcomes of projects making up the set of interventions within Outcome 3. |

# 2. Context of the Country Programme (2012-2016)

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is a high-income country with a per capita GDP of US$ 17,819 and total GDP of US$ 752 billion in 2014[[3]](#footnote-3). Saudi Arabia has an estimated population of approximately 31 million for 2014 with 21 million Saudis and 10 million expatriates[[4]](#footnote-4). Almost half the population is below the age of 24[[5]](#footnote-5). Saudi Arabia’s HDI increased from 0.77 in 2012 to 0.837 in 2015 - which places it in the very high human development category - at 39 out of 188 countries and territories[[6]](#footnote-6).

The Ninth National Development Plan (2009–2014) contributed to continuous economic growth, provision of job opportunities, increased income, expansion of infrastructure projects, establishment of basic industries, expansion of public health, and construction of public facilities. It has resulted in continuous improvement of citizen's standard of living and their quality of life. During this period the real economic growth rate averaged 4 per cent. Several programmes have been implemented aimed at increasing employment of Saudis[[7]](#footnote-7). Saudi Arabia has also achieved all the Millennium Development Goals at the national level. However, since 2015, Saudi Arabia’s fiscal performance was marked by the decrease in government revenues mainly driven by lower oil prices and the war in Yemen.

During the period of 2012-2016 and currently, Saudi Arabia faces many challenges, including diversifying the economy; building Saudi human capacities to lead and participate in the new industrial and service sectors, thereby decreasing reliance on foreign workers; more effectively translating national policies into human development gains through improved governance and public administration; developing capacities to ensure that growth proceeds with equity, with respect to issues of human rights, women, youth, the vulnerable and disabled and in different regions[[8]](#footnote-8); and engaging in global issues of climate change and environment. With the high dependence on the petroleum sector, accounting for roughly 80 per cent of budget revenues, 45 per cent of GDP, and 90 per cent of export earnings, Saudi Arabia is encouraging the diversification of the economy through the growth of the private sector and increasing employment of Saudi nationals. The government is particularly focused on employing the country’s large youth population, primarily in the private sector. To create an active and productive private-sector, raising the skills of Saudi workers through education and training is needed.

Saudi Arabia has made a major achievement regarding the political and economic empowerment of women who account for 20 per cent of members of Shura Council. Women for the first time voted and stood as candidates in municipal elections in December 2015. The voting age was lowered to 18 to allow for more youth participation. 21 women secured municipal councils seats in different regions of the country. The participation of women in the job market is increasing and new work opportunities within the private sector have been opening. The largest portion of Saudis work in the government sector representing 66% of the total employed Saudis, with males constituting about 53% and females about 13%.[[9]](#footnote-9) Although women participation in higher education is high, the unemployment rate amongst women remains at a high 33.3 per cent[[10]](#footnote-10). Unemployment is high among youth graduates from universities reaching 5% among males and as high as 34% among females in 2014[[11]](#footnote-11). The Gender Inequality Index value is at 0.284 globally ranking at 56[[12]](#footnote-12). Job matching between graduates and industry needs is a challenge.

Major step ahead towards undertaking sweeping socio-economic reforms is the adoption of the Saudi Vision 2030. This important strategy aims to diversify the economy away from its dependence on oil; establish a huge Public Investment Fund through the sale of 5% of ARAMCO; create job opportunities for youth, with equal opportunities for men and women, primarily in the private sector; focusing on the promotion of small and medium enterprises; privatization of national entities, amongst a number of other actions. A National Transformation Plan (NTP) 2020 is launched specifying targets and projects to be implemented by each line ministry. Finally, Saudi Arabia adopted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will provide an opportunity to ensure integrated policy approaches to address the challenges at hand with clearly defined targets for coordinated implementation.

# 3. Key findings

## Relevance of the Intended Outcome and related outputs

The relevance of the UNDP CPD Outcome 3 interventions has been assessed using available data, facts and statistics for the period of 2012-2016 as well as relevant policy and strategic documents of the KSA Government, focusing on economic reforms and development. Interviews with key stakeholders were also used to triangulate findings.

**Outcome 3 is closely aligned with the strategic directions of the government and the UN system globally and within KSA.**UNDP work in KSA in the period of 2012-2016 has been organised within three outcomes stipulated in the CDP, namely addressing (1) socio-economic and institutional reform; (2) environmental sustainability; and (3) sustainable development. CPD also sets out three cross-cutting priorities: capacity development, global partnerships and gender mainstreaming. In operational terms, UNDP work is organised within three portfolios, Democratic Governance, Environment and Energy, and Human Development. Projects contributing to the three outcomes are administered within three portfolios, with interventions from different portfolios contributing to more than one outcome. Within Outcome 3, during the reference period, there have been 13 projects, majority of which have been long term partnership interventions between UNDP and KSA Government, some dating back to 1970ies, while there are also examples of new partnerships (such as with PEEC and with SFDA).

**UNDP in partnership with KSA Government applies a broad approach, tackling a variety of sectors and thematic areas, some of which do not directly relate to the Outcome 3**. Projects focus on a number of areas, addressing the needs of Saudi society, including investments in capacities of the different government institutions and support to policy making and reporting on important policies mainly through technical assistance. Support is provided by bringing together local and international experts to work together on strengthening capacities, mechanisms and policies in areas of foreign affairs, elections, tourism, transport, strategic planning, Human Development Planning, IT, public education, urban planning, etc. The projects and programmes implemented within the ongoing CPD include both follow up or ongoing projects from previous phases of UNDP work in the country (e.g. Sustainable Road and Transport Management, Advisory Services to Saudi CITC, etc) or new projects (e.g. Public Education Evaluation, Support SFDA second strategic plan implementation) making them medium to long-term investments in overall development of the country.

Document review and stakeholder consultations conducted within the scope of this Evaluation show that the **Outcome 3 is aligned with** **needs and priorities of KSA government in the areas contributing to sustainable development.** These priorities have been recognized by the government in a number of strategic documents, primarily the Ninth National Development Plan, but also aligning with sectoral strategies in Transport, Education, Spatial Strategy, Rural Strategy, etc. The Outcome “Sustainable development mainstreamed across economy” is aligned with the Kingdom’s the Ninth Development Plan 2010–2014 objectives; specifically, it works in support of Objective 3: To achieve sustainable economic and social development by accelerating the rate of economic growth and social welfare; Objective 4: Balanced regional development; Objective 7: To diversify the economic base horizontally and vertically, expand the absorptive and productive capacities of the national economy and enhance its competitiveness, and maximize the return on competitive advantages; Objective 8: *To move towards a knowledge-based economy and consolidate the basis of an information society*.

Individual projects align with or helped to develop and monitor respective sectoral strategies (e.g. the National Strategy for the Transition to a Knowledge Society, the National Transportation Strategy, the National Strategy for Social Development, the National Strategy for Development of Handicrafts and Traditional Industries, the National Spatial Strategy, The National Statistical Development Strategy (NSDS), Umbrella Programme for Tourism is aligned with the National Tourism Development Strategy, etc.).

The most important input for relevance of the UNDP support for development of KSA policies and mechanisms is the fact that the request for UNDP support comes from the KSA government. Outcome-related projects were formulated based on request from the government and in close cooperation with key national stakeholders, primarily the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) as the coordinating agency for UNDP-supported projects, and the Ministry of Economy and Planning (MOEP), but also ministries and authorities within respective supported sectors and other government partners. This approach ensures high level of relevance and response to recognised needs of the local reform context.

UNDP and KSA government partners have chosen appropriate **programmatic strategies** to secure successful implementation of project activities within the context of KSA. Support was primarily directed towards policy and technical assistance support to government ministries and authorities, with institutions as primary receivers of the support. Ongoing coordination with government counterparts ensured continued alignment of projects to the needs, so the interventions remained relevant throughout the reference period. The exception to this is the National Open Source Software Resources Center – KACST project which was discontinued.

To respond to the priorities of the governmental strategies and the needs for improved services and policy frameworks in areas of importance for sustainable development mainstreaming in economy, UNDP interventions targeted capacity needs for policy development and reporting, as well as capacity needs for establishment and strengthening mechanisms in different areas of relevance for the Outcome.

Considering UNDP strategic framework, Outcome 3 is in line with the UN Country Cooperation Strategic Framework (UNCCSF) OUTCOME #1: *Inclusive Growth and Employment*, and #3 *Governance*. It is also aligned with MDGs and strategic directions of UNDP globally.

Review of programmatic aspects of UNDP’s projects shows that Human Rights based approach is applied in programming of some interventions, but not applied systematically and this is a weakness of programming. Also, Gender equality principle has not been at the forefront of UNDP’s strategy. The latter is contextual challenge which is beyond control of UNDP and reflects the context of Saudi Arabia which is very complex from the perspective of gender mainstreaming.

## Efficiency

UNDP in Saudi Arabia pursues the National Implementation (NIM) modality for development projects with the key objective of enhancing the national capacities in delivering and maintaining results. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) is the coordinating agency for UNDP-supported projects, whereas the Ministry of Economy and Planning (MoEP) is a key partner which sets the national directives of planning in terms of five-year National Development Plans (NDPs). UNDP and MoFA usually agree on specific short-term outcomes that are in line with the national development priorities as set out by the relevant NDP as well as in line with the corporate orientation of UNDP.

**Efficiency in terms of human resources is satisfactory.**  UNDP organises its work in close liaison with the KSA government, assigning experts to partner institutions as per needs stated in the respective Project documents. The UNDP country team is lean, it manages outsourcing of experts and administration of the project deliverables as per agreed timeframes. Projects tend to employ international expertise for all areas of support for bringing in international experiences and models and development of new procedures, with some instances of employing local expertise, though this is the practice that needs further investment, in order to invest in human capital by utilising and building on the experience and expertise of local experts. Partner institutions nominate project management teams within their structures, thus ensuring that there is hands-on management of projects. This, on one side, is a good approach, as institutions ensure that activities are needs-based and that utilisation of expertise is ensured. On the other hand, it leaves UNDP pretty much out of the loop in many instances, making it more difficult to conduct systematic monitoring and evaluation, due to very fact that in many instances it is difficult to get consistent monitoring data and feedback from the partner institutions. This is a weakness of project implementation, that is closely related to context of UNDP work in KSA.

**Efficiency in terms of financial resources is satisfactory.**  The CPD stated that allocation for Outcome 3 would be 20 million USD. Analysis of allocations for projects falling within Outcome 3 show that actual allocation as per project budget was much higher, initial allocation was 65,464,919 USD and actual allocation was much higher, showing that actual allocation was 67,135,682 USD even without update information on actual allocations for three (3) projects – meaning that the overall actual budget is still significantly higher. Analysis of available information for the projects shows that there were no significant deviations or problems with financial management. In many cases, government decided to increase allocations which aslo meant adding more components for projects. The overview of forecasted and actual budget allocations is provided in the Graph 1 below.

Graph 1: Overview of budget allocations

**UNDP monitoring and evaluation procedures in KSA are hampered by difficulties to get consistent monitoring data, but also lack of organised system of M&E within the Office**. This evaluation could not establish the evidence of exchange of data across portfolios. Projects within Outcome 3 have inconsistent approach to collection and analysis of their data making it difficult to reflect on the status of results leading to Outcome 3. This is somewhat understandable having in mind the context in which projects are implemented: project teams and management are government representatives who adhere to government monitoring rules and do not necessarily share the monitoring data with UNDP. Main difficulty is that projects are subject to 100% government cost-sharing, thus giving UNDP less space to put pressure on M&E requirements required by UNDP standards. Such management relation between UNDP and government partners is an area for improvement towards fulfilling joint effort for more consistent monitoring and evaluation of interventions. Project data is aggregated towards reflection on the Outcome once per year, as part of Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), which is done in the corporate system.

**Document review and stakeholder consultations point to the fact that programme/project outputs are delivered in a timely manner** and that the approaches and interventions applied are viable and efficient in achievement of results. Also, the interviews reveal openness and interest of partners from the government in planning and implementation of the interventions, strengthening the relevance of the UNDP Interventions to developmental context of KSA.

Another important efficiency and effectiveness factor is **UNDP’s credibility, global expertise and “UN hat”**, which is recognised by government partners as important value added to their efforts. Interviewed government partners and experts agree that UNDP brings value to policy and programmatic interventions in Saudi Arabia through their ability to tap into global knowledge in areas of economic planning, sustainable development, institutional and individual capacities, among a range of thematic areas. UNDP’s support through building links with international partners and in building capacities in different areas has been appreciated and confirmed through long term partnerships with the Government.

## Effectiveness: Progress towards Achievement of the Outcome

This section provides an assessment of the extent to which the implemented interventions were effective in achievement of the outputs contributing to overall Outcome of mainstreaming sustainable development in economy. In doing so, the evaluation looks at output materialisation through UNDP projects, analysing their observed results and making links to the Outcome 3. Outputs which were redefined for the purpose of this evaluation are used as basis for analysis.

**Output 1. Government policy and institutional capacities improved in the areas of transport, safety, tourism, education, urban, economic and sustainable development planning**

*UNDP Interventions have contributed to increasing institutional and policy capacities of partner government institutions, through investment in skills, linkages, building expertise and new models across the board of UNDP projects and programmes. There is evidence of new mechanisms and models integrated in policies and institutional structures of partner institutions in sectors of transport, food and drug safety, tourism, education, urban, economic and sustainable development planning.*

**Support to tourism sector resulted in increased capacities and diversified educational offer to include tourism education.** Within its efforts to diversify economy, the KSA government invests in tourism as an economic tool to create more jobs for Saudis as well as to develop small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Support to tourism sector is organised through work of the Supreme Commission for Tourism and Antiquities (SCTA) and the Saudi Commission for Tourism & National Heritage, which has a mandate to draft policies and stir programmes towards strengthening tourism potential in KSA. Within the context government efforts to increase economic diversification, including the increased contribution of promising services sectors such as tourism, UNDP has cooperated with the Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage (SCTH) on institutional capacity building as well as providing advisory services in meeting the SCTH’s mandate as the central body responsible for activating the tourist industry and strengthening its role as a major contributor to the national economy with a positive social, cultural and environmental impact. Desk review of available documentation shows that, within the project, UNDP supported the SCTH in the process of establishment of the National Centre for Promotion of Handcrafts, and in development of master-plans for two tourist attractions, one at the Arabian Gulf and the other along the Red Sea coast. Desk review shows that another area of support within the project was to invest in developing tourism capacities through trainings of tourist guides, resulting in 118 national tourist guides trained in rural areas of antiquity sites (namely, the Western Region areas of the Red Sea). More recently, the Programme actively supported capacity development programmes for the creation of key 9 professions (tour guides, accommodation service providers, tour package planners, etc.) with emphasis on pro-poor growth to maintain meaningful jobs in targeted rural areas. This was done through facilitating dialogue between SCTH and Ministry of Education to develop curriculum for tourism sector and development and delivery of Training of Trainers programme, and its delivery in 26 selected primary and secondary schools (two schools at each region).

**UNDP support to transport sector resulted in increased capacities of the KSA government to implement the National Transport strategy.** UNDP’s cooperation with KSA Government, and specifically Ministry of Transport and Communications has been long term, dating back from 1970ies. Within the reference period of the evaluation, UNDP cooperated with the Ministry in the framework of project “Sustainable Road and Transport Management”, supporting the implementation of the National Transport Strategy, through capacity building and application of international best practices for monitoring and reporting of the National Transportation Strategy and for establishing planning procedures and transport statistics system. Within the institutional capacity building efforts, UNDP supported development of Intelligent Transport System applications and the Multimodal Logistics Development Plan for Saudi Arabia through bringing international and local expertise in this process, while also facilitating links with the United Nations specialized agency for information and communication technologies (ITU). Another area of support that was viewed by interviewed stakeholders as important was the support to development of the Terms of Reference for development of the National Transport Infrastructure Plan. Within capacity development, more than 5 training session and workshops on Intelligent Transport System (ITS) operations and maintenance were held. Also, the final report on ITS design for Dammam Highway Traffics Management System has been submitted and approved; and a report on gap analysis and need assessment for safe road design has also been delivered to the Ministry. Interviews conducted confirm that UNDP support was beneficial and contributed a lot to improvement of Ministry’s capacities in the areas of concern of the project.

**UNDP support was important contribution to strengthening strategic planning, macro and sectoral policy analysis, regional socio-economic planning and development, and plan monitoring.** Support materialising through long term partnership between KSA government and UNDP, Sustainable Development Policy and Planning, focused on capacity building for the Ministry of Economy and Planning (MoEP), aimed at supporting the Ninth National Development Plan (NDP; 2010-14) and indirectly the National Transformation Plan and Saudi Vision 2030. Within the project, efforts were directed on integrating three pillars of sustainable development highlighted in specific chapters in the 9th NDP, namely: (1) Mainstreaming Sustainability into Development Policy: designing policies to diversify growth through regional development and knowledge economy; (2) Green Economy: strategies for enhancing efficiency of resource use and clean technologies for energy, water, mining, etc, and (3) Social Empowerment: strategies and policies for poverty reduction, including youth and women employment; research on social subsidies, and social safety nets. UNDP provided policy formulation support and development of strategic options to the national partners coupled with capacity building activities, resulting in finalization and adoption of the 10th National Development Plan (NDP) 2015-2019. Assistance included updating the mathematical models underlying the scenario planning processes, inclusion of population policies and balanced regional planning. In consequence, the plan focuses on HDI in both its policies orientation and budget allocations as evident when compared with policies and allocations of the ninth development plan, reflecting significant increase in all HD related dimensions (20% Human Resource Development, 24% Social and Health and 29% in Economic resource development).

Within efforts to assist the MEP, Socio-Economically Effective Human Development (HD) Planning project was implemented as supporting tool to provide the Ministry with computable general equilibrium (CGE) models to prepare development policies that address economic and social challenges. The CGE Model for the KSA Economy for the Macroeconomic and Social Policies, as well as for the sectorial interactions, has been constructed and offered to the local authorities. In addition, template with its screen used by non-specialists in the Ministry has also constructed on C++ program.

**Capacities and mechanisms for improved drug and food safety have been increased with assistance of UNDP.** UNDP provided technical assistance to the Saudi Food and Drugs Authority (SFDA) in achieving its strategic goals set out in SFDA second strategic plan, through enabling SFDA to implement Food, Drugs and medical Devices strategic goals and initiatives laid out in their second strategic plan; as well as develop the required institutional capacity to discharge its mandate and ultimately meet the national development plan’s aspiration to achieve its vision. Within this support effort, UNDP assisted SFDA to build broad and deep capabilities for developing systems and processes to improve pro-activity in addressing emerging risk in food and drug safety. Support was provided through advisory services, specialized experts, and administrative support to SFDA, including also connecting the SFDA with USDA. Project collaboration resulting in setting of new procedures for such products i.e. herbal tea for babies in collaboration with drug sector and risk team in food sector; connecting the central laboratory with all Port laboratories, which accelerated the speed of the examinations. Capacities of the SFDA were strengthened also through training of ten inspectors have been trained on manufacturing of Biopharmaceuticals. The SFDA lab has achieved 78% in regards to ISO accreditation. Finally, Track and Trace system has been established for monitoring of inventory.

**UNDP contribution to improvement of technical and regulatory capacities for organisation of public education was positive**. The Public Education Evaluation Commission (PEEC) and UNDP established cooperation within the project to support technical and regulatory capacity building efforts of the PEEC in managing the educational process in the Kingdom, as well as to develop a comprehensive assessment of the Commission's areas of work in terms of school performance, educational programmes, school accreditation, and programme accreditation. UNDP’s support was also directed towards assistance to develop strategic plan to evaluate the public and private education and an action plan to assess and build a quality system and professional licensing system for professionals in the public education institutions and units. This would lead to the mechanisms for management of qualifications to ensure the establishment of a national framework for qualifications that achieves effective linkage between the outputs of the educational system and the requirements of development and labour market. Cooperation with the PEEC was based on the findings of the study conducted by the Ministry of Education which recommended to enhance the quality of public education, develop evaluation methods and activate the role of private education. Emphasis of the study was on formulation of strategy and preparation of the (PEEC) plan.

The cooperation between UNDP and PEEC has been dynamic, with UNDP’s role in making links between PEEC and their peer institution in Australia – ACARA. This institution was found to have most directly relevant experience in public education standards, which was useful for replication of practices and knowhow with PEEC. Because of cooperation within the project, PEEC designed the National Curriculum Standards Programme, first of such kind developed outside the Ministry of Education. Development of the Programme was conducted in participatory manner, by inclusion of local and regional education professionals, to ensure that the standards match both educational goals and cultural values. As the second step, the project contributed to establishment of specialisation framework and work on building educational curriculum standards as well as preparation of manuals for public education. More specifically, the following were developed: math Science and Arabic assessment frameworks for grades 3 and 6, 512 curriculum items for Math and science, and 810 items for Arabic language, 12 forms of tests for each subject (Math, Science, & Arabic); 4 forms for students’ questionnaires, 1 for teachers, and 1 for parents; 4 manuals which cover item development, operations, marking, and analysis and reporting); Operation manual which includes the processes and forms that are used to communicate with schools and preparing them for the national tests; A hotline to answer inquiries regarding tests from schools and address any issues that comes up during the test administration days. Interviews with PEEC showed that main benefits of the cooperation were the knowledge exchange and ability to benefit from international practices and expertise, as well as direct support to improved planning in the field of public education. As per interviews, this support transformed the way in which education is organised as well as establishment of a critical mass of professionals who can continue working on development curriculum blocks for different subjects.

**UNDP technical assistance was beneficial for updating the National Spatial Strategy (NSS) to incorporate the recent socioeconomic development objectives as expressed in the national development plans, but this is the field where further investment is needed**. Cooperation with the Ministry of Municipal and Rural Affairs (MOMRA) is another long-term partnership nurtured by UNDP. In previous CPD, this cooperation resulted in adoption of NSS, and the support within the reference period was directed in supporting efforts to develop national capacities in delivering the objectives and priorities of Strategy, with specific emphasis on balanced regional development among regions, diversification of the economic base and enhancement of the competitive capacities. Particularly were important efforts to integrate the NSS and National Socio-Economic Plan, as the links between the two are weak. Main issue in this area is integrating urban planning in economic and other policies, as urban planning has direct relevance to economic development. Efforts to integrate spatial planning with economic development is proven to be a good investment, but too early to assess effects. This is an area for further work of UNDP in the upcoming period.

**Output 2. Government reporting improved by improved quality of Key performance indicators and systematic data collection and analysis**

*UNDP interventions contribute to enhanced capacities of KSA government to organize and improve evidence based policy and reporting mechanisms, through capacity building, and direct work with government institutions towards improved Key Performance Indicators of growth and economic development. This is an important investment in building evidence based policy making and adequate analysis of developmental policies adopted by the government.*

In the previous section, projects ‘contribution to improved strategic planning and implementation were presented. Desk review and interviews confirmed that the support was positive and assisted the government to improve planning, particularly in terms of integrating different socio-economic aspects. It is important to note that majority of these projects also had the component of assistance to the government to improve measurability of policy delivery in the different areas of support.

UNDP support to National Transport strategy (NTS) included important measures to ensure NTS Reporting and Review Mechanisms are in place to analyse and reflect on delivery of the strategy and constraints. Within the project, technical assistance was provided in preparation of the NTS Status Reports, which are increasingly becoming a standard in analysing the outcomes of the strategy as confirmed by the interlocutors from the MoTC.

Within efforts to assist the MoEP, Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning project integrated important component of technical assistance to develop indicators of achievement for the objectives and policies of the governmental operational plans that are quantitative and measurable, intended for 75 different State actors; and to provide a support system for plan preparation and follow-up on plan implementation through the data generated from these indicators. The work with the ministry on the CGE model also included efforts to determine a set of quantitative indicators to be considered in the development of five-year development plans (also applicable on the ten-year plan). Development of indicators were aimed to facilitate follow up on the implementation of those plans; assessment of their achievements, particularly those related to reaching the set goals and implementing the adopted policies through relating them to the objectives of each sector. UNDP support was also beneficial for preparation of reports on implementation of different strategies as well as preparation of NHDR, MDG report for KSA.

UNDP support to Riyadh Urban Observatory also contributed to these efforts. The project was designed to lend technical and substantive assistance to Arriyadh Development Authority (ADA) in maintaining the services of the Riyadh Urban Observatory and extending its products and services to all sectors of the economy in the Riyadh city. Support materialised in production of 80 urban indicators (out of which, 42 are the global UN-Habitat indicators; and the remaining 38 are Riyadh-specific indicators).

Finally, the project Capacity Development for the General Commission for Survey focused assistance towards development ofnational capacities in conducting geo-spatial surveys to contribute to national efforts in achieving the key directions of the Ninth Development Plan (2010-2014) with emphasis on balanced regional development, diversification of the economic base and enhancement of the competitive capacities. However, this evaluation could not establish sound evidence base on the project progress thus far.


Overall, UNDP’s support was defined as positive and beneficial for government counterparts. Investment in building capacities through embedding experts within the beneficiary institutions was a good approach and assisted in filling in the gaps in capacities but also daily support to capacity development. Support to indicator development was an important investment, it assists the government to better monitor and measure developmental interventions. The main area which was under-supported within projects under the Outcome 3 umbrella was lack of gender dimension in project planning and implementation. On one hand, this evident weakness is understood, inherent to KSA’s strict gender standards. Still, UNDP’s advocacy for gender mainstreaming is an area of improvement in project preparation and implementation.

Another important area of improvement is the context within which UNDP interventions within different sectoral areas do not seem to be exploring synergies and potential for replication/multiplication of practices and results. Desk review and interviews show a certain level of fragmentation of support to individual partner institutions, with ‘stovepiping’ happening between projects and programmes, even those which are, by their nature, close thematically and approach-wise. While to some extent it is justified by the very nature of UNDP’s assistance to KSA government which is needs based and directed to assistance to partner institutions, still there is no visible effort of UNDP to consciously advocate and put efforts for stronger integration of interventions. Also, integration of results is also missing internally, within UNDP, which makes it more difficult to reflect on overall contribution of UNDP to developmental goals of KSA government.

## Impact: Status of the Outcome 3: Sustainable Development mainstreamed in Economy

The CPD outcome has one indicator, Increase in HDI. The baseline as per the CPD was HDI 0.77. Review of the outcome indicator per 2015 Human Development Report (HDR) shows an increase of HDI in the reference period from 0.77 to 0.873 (See Chart 1 below), placing the country in the very high human development category and positioning it at 39 out of 188 countries and territories. Having achieved most of the MDGs, Saudi Arabia has indicated its commitment to the implementation of the SDGs at the highest levels.

Graph 2: Trends in Saudi Arabia’s HDI component indices 1990-2014



Desk review of KSA developmental strategies, particularly the National Transformation Plan and Saudi Vision 2030, but also 9th and 10th National Development Plans shows increased integration of elements of sustainable development in policies. For example, the Saudi Vision 2030 integrates all elements of sustainable development, Environment, Society and Economy, mainstreaming smart use of resources, investment in society and diversification of economy as drivers of development of the country. Review of consecutive National Development plans shows increased mainstreaming of these elements, which is clear indicator of governments commitment to integrate sustainable development planning to extent possible in the cultural context of the country. This is an important investment, particularly in light of the fact that KSA needs to diversify its economy in order to decrease its reliance on oil revenues.

### 3.4.1 UNDP Contributions to the Outcome 3

**Progress has been made** towards achieving the intended outcome to mainstream sustainable development in economy. UNDP’s contribution to this outcome has **yielded results** particularly for development planning and measuring results through investments in improvement of policies and performance indicators and reporting mechanisms. Results have also been yielded in expanding the institutional capacities of different agencies and institutions to reach safe and improved access to healthy food, transport and urban management services.

Results, notably relating to increasing capacities of government authorities, support to policy and strategic planning, investment in knowledge and skills, partnerships and international cooperation, have contributed to increase of the human capital and improved governance, thus **improving the chances of positively influencing the outcome**. Review of project documents as well as engagements with the government representatives and experts indicate that the interventions towards achievement of outputs constitute noteworthy contribution to the achievement of the stated outcome.

Desk review and interviews point that UNDP’s support was **encouraging** formulation and implementation of development agenda and related sectoral strategies and planning documents of the government to further implement of National Transformation Plan and 9th and 10th National Development Plans (implemented within the period of CPD). UNDP has been supporting the government to develop overall and sectoral strategies (inputs for Tourism Strategy, NTS, NSS, 10th National Development Plan, etc.), at the same time investing in modelling new approaches (e.g. transport master planning, CDG models, etc.), and operationalisation of adopted strategic documents. Review of available strategies shows that care is invested in ensuring that, apart from being financially and economically viable, projects and measures must minimise negative human and environmental impacts and apply the highest standards in planning, design and management. However, implementation of these policies, and thus real-time mainstreaming of sustainable development in economy remains to be ensured.

Desk review and interviews also confirm that UNDP support was **instrumental** for improvement of government capacities to measure results of implementation of strategies and plans, through investment into development of KPIs and capacities for evidence based policy planning. Also, UNDP technical assistance has contributed to raising awareness and understanding of importance of environmental and social impact assessments as integral parts of sound policy planning and implementation. Their utilisation needs to be followed up as a next step of UNDP work.

UNDP work in KSA in the reference period was organized within three outcomes, under which projects dealing with women and youth engagement, natural resources, environment and energy were also implemented. Review of evaluations conducted for the two outcomes[[13]](#footnote-13) shows that UNDP was on a track to achieving or achieved outputs relating to the Outcomes 1 and 2, while recognising also that there are important new measures by the government to tackle issues relating to the outcomes. By definition, sustainable development means long-term stability of the economy and environment that is only achievable through the integration and acknowledgement of economic, environmental, and social concerns throughout the decision-making process. If UNDP’s interventions are looked at from holistic perspective and in light of conclusions of the two other evaluations, UNDP’s interventions contribute to mainstreaming sustainable development principles in economy. However, this evaluation could only rely on the evaluations as source of information to make this conclusion as no further interviews with projects or government officials dealing with natural resources, environment, youth and women were conducted.

## Factors Influencing UNDP Contribution to the Outcome

This section presents relevant drivers and hindering factors for the success of UNDP as identified through document and literature review, as well as stakeholder consultations.

**DRIVERS**

**Main driver for UNDP’s positive engagement with the KSA government is its UN “hat”.** Government counterparts see UNDP as providing the added value of “UN hat”: accessibility to international agencies and peer institutions from other countries is higher when links and partnerships are facilitated by UNDP. Examples were given for cooperation with USDA, or with Australian curriculum assessment agency ACARA, or ITU – all of which were facilitated by UNDP. Interlocutors agree that, while they can establish direct links with these (or such) agencies, with facilitation of UNDP it goes faster and cooperation agreements are not as rigid as they would be if links were established directly.

**Another important driver is UNDP’s international experience and global expertise.** Interviews with government counterparts confirm that appropriate expertise was provided, often at lower transaction cost than commercial providers. Namely, KSA government utilises a lot of expert assistance by commercial consulting companies for an array of policy areas. However, government counterparts reflect that, while consultants outsourced through consulting companies are ‘top notch’, their engagement is either short term or organised in missions to KSA. On a contrary, UNDP engages consultants for long term in-house technical assistance through embedded consultants which ensures that the government gets long term assistance for areas where cooperation is provided. This is an important added value, as consultants work on an array of tasks within the beneficiary institution, also filling in the gaps for areas where institutional capacities are lower. Also, such approach ensures that in-house advisory (or mentoring) happens.

**Flexible and timely provision of technical assistance based on needs of government partners ensures ownership over results by government**. Most of the interventions assessed within this evaluation represent long term partnership between the government and UNDP. Some of them, like support to transport sector, date back from 1970ies. UNDP support is valued as it ensures that technical assistance is provided in timely manner and administered per transparent and flexible rules, which ensures assistance matches the needs of the institutions. Also, UNDP ensures that the assistance is long term, which adds to continuity of support. Finally, responsiveness to government needs as well as placing projects within institutions, where project is managed by institution ensures ownership over results.

**HINDERING FACTORS**

**Main hindering factor for full integration of sustainable development into economy is the economic crisis and slow pace of KSA government to diversify economy to be less depended on oil revenues.** The Saudi Arabian economy is heavily dependent on the oil revenues, whereby oil revenue paid for 73% of the government’s budget in 2015. Recent decline in prices of oil in 2015 and 2016 presented a severe oil shock for the economy, with slight recovery mid-June 2016, but prices remain half of what they were two years ago. As oil revenue fell, the budget deficit increased from 3.4% of GDP in 2014 to 16.3% in 2015. Foreign exchange reserves dropped by $116 billion in 2015. Within efforts to create measures for less dependence on oil, the government has undertaken major economic changes within the framework of Vision 2030. The Vision presents reform agenda to ensure changes of employment structure in the form of reduction of government employment towards employment in diverse economic areas, and preferences preferential treatment of Saudi citizens over migrants for employment. The Vision also proposes increases in revenue from tourism, and greater production of non-oil minerals and more processing of raw materials. However, desk review of different analytical documents on KSA economy point that this change will be incremental and slow, particularly due to lack of systematic measures to include women more proactively in the labour market (or decision making).

**Another important hindering factor, closely connected to the above mentioned one is the level of capacity/commitment of government to integrate sustainable development into planning of economic (and social) programmes.** Desk review and interviews show that, while the government has adopted important policy documents for deep reforms, government institutions are slowly picking pace towards actually implementing them. Certain level of fragmentation and ‘stovepiping’ is evident in the government, which is reflected in lack of systematic approach to participatory government decision making (defined as inclusive process whereby different sector institutions are invited in drafting policies of cross-cutting nature). While sectoral or cross-sectoral strategies are usually prepared by institution/ministry dealing with such respective sector with very limited or without engagement of representatives of other sectors, National Transformation Plan was the exception and good example where development of the Plan was organised in participatory manner – inviting all relevant institutions around the same table. This contributed to increasing the quality of the document. Such practice should be continued and expanded.

Desk review and interviews also show that there are weaknesses in effective implementation of reforms. Often, adopted strategies are not implemented to extent that would bring desired changes (.e.g. Spatial strategy, Transport strategy).

High turnover in government institutions/ministries, particularly at higher levels of management, depending on changes in government. This is a hindering factor that affects project efforts and continuity, affecting also loss of institutional memory.

On operational level, at UNDP, **main hindering factor affecting operations is the lack of appropriate monitoring systems in UNDP**. While to some extent this lack is justified by the fact that projects are managed by institutions receiving assistance, still it seems that UNDP does not take more proactive measures to ensure monitoring mechanisms are in place and applied. This represents visible obstacle to understanding how UNDP interventions contribute to set outcomes.

## 3.6 Sustainability

This section analyses the sustainability prospects of outputs of UNDP contributing to the Outcome 3 of the CPD 2012-2016. Following up on the approach taken in the effectiveness section, findings and analysis of sustainability are also organised as per the two Outputs proposed for the purpose of this evaluation.

**Sustainability prospects of the achievements of outputs within outcome are mixed.**

**UNDP’s contribution to institutional capacity development and training is relatively sustainable**. Desk review and interviews show that Government policy and institutional capacities have been improved in all areas of UNDP intervention within Outcome 3 (namely, transport, food safety, tourism, education, urban, economic and sustainable development planning). Many new policies and mechanisms have been adopted or under implementation, with assistance of UNDP. During the field phase, the representatives of the ministries and interviewed government bodies provided evidence and confirmation of UNDP’s positive inputs to reform processes. Nevertheless, all stakeholders agree that implementation of full-fledged reforms, however necessary, depend on political will and commitment, which is beyond the influence of UNDP. Another obstacle to impact and sustainability is the fact that policies and strategies are still not designed applying participatory approach (both internally – within the government institutions and externally – with inclusion of society), which makes it difficult to ensure that the measures are adequate while also diminishing the potential for holistic approach to reforms.

UNDP contributed to building capacities for development and application of KPIs in government reporting as well as overall improvement of statistics system in the country. This is a positive move, presenting strong foundations for sustainability. However, it is too early to assess to what extent the government will consistently apply the KPIs in their work and measuring of progress of reforms.

Closely linked also is the context of turnover of staff and decision makers in the institutions, which affects the level of institutional memory but also changing commitment to agreed approaches and methodologies of work. UNDP, through its technical assistance invests efforts in building capacities of professionals engaged in work of partner government institutions, these outputs have been instrumental for the government. This support materialises in sharing know how, models, tools and guidelines for introduction of new or strengthening existing mechanisms within institutionsthroughlonger term partnerships with international players, trainings, professionalization and long term advisory. Turnover of staff and management, where and when it happens, affects negatively the adoption and application of this acquired knowledge and skills. Another risk is overdependence on consultants, which may, in the long term, diminish government’s possibility to drive the reforms with national expertise.

**UNDP Projects do not have sustainability/exit strategy.** At operational level, UNDP and the government have long and established partnerships, which at times make it redundant to develop exit/ sustainability strategies, as new areas of support always arise. Also, review of UNDP supported areas that have been finalised shows that financial sustainability is not an issue since an end of a project with UNDP does not mean the end of the progress made, the country has sufficient funds to carry on, the projects being funded by the national partners, not by UNDP. However, this is a weakness in programming, particularly from the point of view of potential for overdependence on (international) consultants.

# 4. Conclusions

Outcome 3 “*Sustainable Development mainstreamed in economy”* is one of the three outcomes defined in the UNDP Country Progeramme Document 2012-2016. UNDP’s work to support this outcome is organised within a portfolio of 13 projects, tackling various sectoral areas of the work of the government, and many of them represent projects within long term engagement and partnership with the government. This section presents main conclusions drawn from the evaluation process, as summed up by OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

**Interventions contributing to Outcome 3 are relevant** **and align with developmental and reform processes** undertaken by the Government of KSA in different areas, including but not limited to economic planning, tourism, transport, spatial strategies, education, food safety, etc.UNDP KSA programmes are also aligned with UNDP corporate strategies. UNDP applies adequate programmatic strategies that enhance potential for achievement of results. However, gender mainstreaming and human rights approach are not applied systematically and this is an important area for improvement of programming of UNDP support.

***UNDP Country office is lean and efficient in administering support to the government. Interventions are implemented strategically and efficiently, ensuring timeliness and effective utilisation of resources***. Lean country team and pool of international and local experts for respective areas of interventions has been positive efficiency factor, together with UNDP’s ongoing success to maintain good cooperation with the government. The main weakness is found in monitoring and evaluation systems of the office, whereby lack of systematic monitoring hinders reflection on results.

***Contribution of individual projects towards the Outputs defined within this Outcome are positive, overall***. Majority of projects supporting the Outcome 3 are part of the long-term partnership framework between UNDP and KSA government, and are fully needs based, which is a facilitating factor for their success in achieving their planned objectives. This evaluation found evidence of contributions to progress towards outputs contributing to the Outcome 3. contributions were made in increasing institutional and policy capacities for development of evidence based strategies and more systematic measurement of results, also ensured through establishment of Key performance indicators. investment in providing inputs to policies through technical assistance has been positive, contributing to development and/or implementation of important strategies contributing to sustainable development.

***UNDP interventions have contributed to mainstreaming of sustainable development in economy.*** Assessment of set Outcome 3 indicator shows increase in HDI in the reference period of the evaluation. Review of government policies and Vision 2030 shows that sustainable development elements are integrated in economic and other policies, whereby measures are more comprehensive and more inclusive.Efforts to model and strengthen capacities for developmental planning, including also sectoral policy making bring positive effects in ways how respective institutions operate. Supporting these efforts, UNDP contributed to laying the foundations for future efforts by national actors in ensuring equitable and accessible economic development. Established systems and mechanisms, particularly those assisting integration of policies already show positive effects. At the same time, investment in building capacities and joint efforts to develop key performance indicators for government policies is a good foundation for more systematic measurement of reformist results.

***Sustainability prospects of achievements within the Outcome 3 are mixed***. The current legal and policy framework is a positive foundation for full-fledged reforms towards sustainable development in the country, but a lot depends on the level of commitment and capacity of government to fully implement these reforms. Also, the fact that policies are not designed in participatory manner, diminishes the potential for holistic approach to reforms and thus their full alliance with the needs of government and population. UNDP contributed to increased capacities, models and mechanisms, but their application is also threatened by turnover of staff and institutional memory of institutions. Economic crisis and slow pace of diversification of economy are also factors affecting impact and sustainability prospects of reforms.

# 5. Recommendations

Findings and conclusions of the evaluation point to the following recommendations, presented below. Each recommendation has an addressee and a proposed timeframe. For ease of reference, recommendations are divided into two categories, as follows:

Table 5: Recommendations

| **No** | **Recommendations** | **Addressee** | **Timing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic Recommendations (S)** | | | |
| **S1** | **Promote coordination and participatory policy planning and monitoring**  UNDP and government partners should take more proactive role in promoting coordination of all sectors in planning and monitoring of reform results. Good example from planning the NTP, whereby policy design process was participatory and inclusive of all government partners should be promoted and replicated in development of other strategies supported, inter alia, by UNDP. Also, potential for participatory planning to include society actors should be explored as per experiences of PEEC process for curriculum development. | UNDP and government partners | 2017 onwards |
| **S2** | **Integrate social, spatial and environmental impact assessment in policy and master planning**  UNDP and government partners should promote, advocate for and conduct social, spatial and environment impact assessments in supported policies. This approach would strengthen policy and planning alignment with sustainable development concept. | UNDP and Government | ongoing |
| **S3** | **Mainstream gender and human rights approach in programming of UNDP support and advocate for gender mainstreaming across government policies**  Gender equality, human rights approach and gender mainstreaming are important cross-cutting pillars of UNDP. In Saudi Arabia generally and in UNDP programmes particularly these are not sufficiently mainstreamed, so efforts should be invested to devise set of measures how to mainstream and integrate these concepts in projects and interventions created and implemented in cooperation with the government, taking into due account the contextual issues in KSA. | UNDP | ongoing |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Operational Recommendations (O)** | | | |
| **O1** | **Develop clear exit strategies for UNDP’s interventions.**  UNDP projects in focus of this evaluation do not have exit or phasing out strategies. Such strategies should be developed to provide clear understanding of steps and measures that need to be institutionalised and/or taken over by the government. | UNDP and government | 2017 |
| **O2** | **Invest efforts to better integrate UNDP interventions towards ensuring holistic approach to sustainable development.**  UNDP CPD 2017-2021 already envisages continuation of many interventions contributing to integration of sustainable development, particularly through its Outcome 1 and 3, but also outcome 2. UNDP should invest efforts to ensure that projects within the three outcomes do not happen in isolation from each other, but that project planning, implementation and monitoring includes awareness of plans and results of other projects contributing to the same overall goal of sustainable development. These efforts would contribute to better reflection of how UNDP interventions in their entirety contributed to Outcomes set in the CPD. | UNDP and government partners | permanently |
| **O3** | **Develop Institutional knowledge management plan**  UNDP CO in KSA does not have a systematic approach to knowledge management and monitoring of interventions implemented within outcome 3. This hinders reflection on results and makes it difficult to understand UNDP’s contribution to reform processes in KSA. Therefore, it is recommended that UNDP internally develop knowledge management plan, which would outline measures and responsibilities for collecting, analyzing and reflection on results. | UNDP | 2017 |
| **O4** | **Develop Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system for UNDP interventions in KSA**  This evaluation faced significant limitation of weak or non-existent monitoring data on assessed interventions. To overcome this, and closely linked to recommendation O4 above, it is advised that UNDP invest in developing a comprehensive M&E system that is based on a set of (internally developed) monitoring indicators to be used for further aggregation of data for CPD outcome indicators. Such system would ensure easier analysis and reflection of achievements and challenges, but also would facilitate decision making and evidencing of new programmes to be developed. | UNDP and Government | 2017 |
| **O5** | **Conduct Meta Evaluation of UNDP’s work in KSA**  Meta Evaluation of UNDP’s work in KSA over the period of 2012-2016 should be conducted to understand the scope and extent to which UNDP has contributed to sustainable development in KSA, through support across sectors. Available evaluations for individual outcomes (albeit at mid-term level for Outcome 2, conducted in 2014) could be used as inputs, while deeper analysis of how investments in natural resources, environment, social empowerment and institutional strengthening contribute collectively to sustainable development in the country. | UNDP | 2017 |

# Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix

| **Evaluation Question** | **Judgement Indicators** | | **Data Sources** | | **Data collection Methods** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevance** | | | | | |
| Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country? | * Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for mainstreaming sustainable development across economy and the content of policy documents, measures and institutional capacities developed with support of UNDP | | * National policy documents * Reports, research studies * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Interviews with UNDP teams * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Saudi Arabia? | * Outcome Objective remained relevant to the government priorities as evidenced by new policy documents of the government | | * National policy documents * Reports, research studies * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion? | * Evidence that human rights based approach is applied in programming * Evidence that gender mainstreaming is understood and pursued in coherent fashion * Evidence that results-based management is applied coherently | | * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Interviews with UNDP teams * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| **Efficiency** | | | | | |
| Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient? | * Financial and human resources spent for the achievement of outputs and results are adequate * evidence of cost-effective interventions * evidence best practices and lessons learned from implementation of efficient/inefficient project are integrated in planning of new interventions | | * Project reports (annual, monitoring) * Interviews with UNDP staff | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the sustainable development portfolio? Where are the gaps if any? | * Management and administrative tasks being discharged timely and respecting established deadlines * Adaptation/flexibility in project implementation * Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in programme implementation | | Programme reports (annual, monitoring)  Interviews with UNDP staff  Interviews with stakeholders and donors | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the sustainable development portfolio? | * Evidence of positive effect of UNDP practices and capabilities on the performance of the sustainable development portfolio * Evidence of positive effect of UNDP policies and decisions on the performance of the sustainable development portfolio * Evidence of mitigation measures taken to ensure that constraints within UNDP do not affect negatively the performance of the sustainable development portfolio | | * Project reports (annual, monitoring) * Interviews with UNDP staff | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| **Effectiveness** | | | | | |
| How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2016? | Evidence and examples of results achieved within individual projects within the efforts to enhance Capacities for Development Planning and Public Administration contributing to the Outcome 3  Evidence and examples of results achieved within individual projects within the efforts towards development of a Knowledge Economy contributing to the Outcome 3 | | * National policy documents * Reports, research studies * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome? | * Evidence of external factors and their effects on UNDP operations * Evidence of successful mitigation strategies for risks and assumptions | | * Project reports (annual, monitoring) * Interviews with UNDP staff * Interviews with key stakeholders from government | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| To what extent has the Cooperation focused on enhancing institutional capacities for results based management and monitoring of NPD results through evidence-based indicator systems at national and local levels including MDG Reports, NHDRs and National and Local Urban Observatory systems? | * Government actors use the knowledge and skills acquired to apply results based management and monitoring of NPD results through evidence-based indicator systems. * Evidence of integration of evidence-based indicator systems at national and local levels * Evidence of integration of evidence-based indicator systems in MDG Reports and NHDRs Evidence of integration of evidence-based indicator systems at National and Local Urban Observatory systems | | * Relevant assessments, reviews, evaluations, research studies * MDG and NHDR reports * Other relevant government and UNDP reports and publications Programme reports (progress, monitoring) * Interviews with key stakeholders and discussion groups * Programme outputs (curricula, manuals, training packages) * Training reports | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews*  *Interviews/ group discussions* |
| Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government? | Evidence of improved transparency of the government  Evidence of improved integrity system of the government | | * Relevant assessments, reviews, evaluations, research studies * Other relevant government and UNDP reports and publications Programme reports (progress, monitoring) * Interviews with key stakeholders and discussion groups * Programme outputs (mechanisms, tools, manuals, training packages) * Training reports | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews*  *Interviews/ group discussions* |
| **Impact** | | | | | |
| What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2016? | | * Intended outcome (i) has been achieved, (ii) has been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) has not been achieved * Quality of outputs and results * Evidence and examples of high/poor effectiveness | | UNDP reports (annual and monitoring)  Interviews with stakeholders, discussion groups | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews*  *Interviews/ group discussions with end beneficiaries to the extent possible* |
| Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable? | | * Evidence of positive results of interventions of support to the Government to increase accountability and transparency to people needs, especially those who vulnerable * Evidence of positive results of interventions of support to the Government to increase sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable | | * National policy documents * Reports, research studies * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance and participatory decision-making? | | * Evidence and examples of results achieved contributing to introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance and participatory decision-making | | * Relevant assessments, reviews, evaluations, research studies * Other relevant government and UNDP reports and publications Programme reports (progress, monitoring) * Interviews with key stakeholders and discussion groups * Programme outputs (mechanisms, tools, manuals, training packages) * Training reports | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews*  *Interviews/ group discussions* |
| Have strategies been launched - including a National Spatial Strategy - for regional balance and specialization, and National Rural Development Strategy for connecting communities to services? | | National Spatial Strategy - for regional balance and specialization finalized and launched  National Rural Development Strategy for connecting communities to services finalized and launched | | * National policy documents * Reports, research studies * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Interviews with UNDP teams * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| **Sustainability** | | | | | |
| To what degree have capacities been developed for global partnerships and mechanisms such as MDG review processes and sharing KSA’s development successes with other countries through UN and related conferences and fora? | * Institutional strategies towards MDG review process and KSA’s development successes are in place and applied * Government policies towards maintenance of global partnerships and mechanisms   encourage continuation   * Government mechanisms and budgets in place for managing, operating and maintaining set institutional measures for maintenance of global partnerships and mechanisms | | * Strategic documents of the government * Reports, research studies * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Interviews with UNDP teams * Project reports * UNDP strategic documents | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| To what extent have new capacities been developed for expansion of areas of new emphasis like tourism and information technology as well as policies and institutional capacities for shifting to a knowledge economy including the role of New Economic Cities? | * Government mechanisms and budgets in place for managing, operating and maintaining policies and mechanisms established for shifting to a knowledge economy * Evidence of appropriate capacity on project level with typology of **“**lessons learnt**”** and **“**best practices**”** | | * Administrative data from government (if available); * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Interviews with UNDP teams * Project reports | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions? | * Evidence of appropriate capacity on project level with typology of **“**lessons learnt**”** and **“**best practices**”** * Staff turnover * Evidence of further funding and implementation of activities following up on results achieved with support of UNDP * Development plans of government institutions in place | | * Administrative data from government (if available); * Interviews with key stakeholders from government * Interviews with UNDP teams * Project reports | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy? | * Evidence of formalized mechanisms for follow up support for Outcome activities * Exit strategy in place and applied | | * Project reports (annual, monitoring) * Interviews with UNDP staff * Interviews with key stakeholders from government | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |
| **Strategic Positioning of UNDP and Partnership strategy** | | | | | |
| Was UNDP’s partnership strategy appropriate and effective in achieving the outcome? | * Inputs provided by beneficiaries during the planning and implementation of interventions within Outcome 3 * Level of coordination and cooperation between partners in programmes contributing to Outcome 3 * Projects’ document contain reference to other interventions promoted by government, donors and the private sector * Number & type of inputs provided by other UN Agencies * Level of coordination and cooperation between partners in programmes * Projects’ documents contain reference to other interventions implemented by UN Agencies | | * Project Reports * Interviews with UNDP staff * Interviews with key stakeholders from government and other partners * Government and donor Reports * UN Agencies reports | | *Document analysis / Data analysis*  *Key Informant Interviews* |

# Annex 2. Terms of Reference

OUTCOME Evaluation:

Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy

Duty station: Home-based with mission to Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Duration: 35 days

Type of contract: Professional Services Contracted

Language required: English, Arabic (an asset)

Background

According to the evaluation plan for 2012-2016 of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Saudi Arabia, an outcome evaluation is to be conducted to assess the impact of programme component of the UNDP’s development assistance:

*Outcome 3* Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy

UNDP in Saudi Arabia would like to evaluate its contribution during 2012-2016 to the achievement of the *Outcome* and take stock of previous efforts and lessons learned. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in Saudi Arabia’s context and the role UNDP has played. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development. Outcome evaluation also should be able to answer whether UNDP supported the Government of Saudi Arabia in meeting the 9th National Development Plans and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

BRIEF NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is a high income country with a per capita GDP of US$ 17,819 and total GDP of US$ 752 billion in 2014[[14]](#footnote-14). Saudi Arabia has an estimated population of approximately 31 million for 2014 with 21 million Saudis and 10 million expatriates[[15]](#footnote-15). Almost half the population is below the age of 24[[16]](#footnote-16). Saudi Arabia’s HDI for 2014 is 0.837 - which places it in the very high human development category - at 39 out of 188 countries and territories[[17]](#footnote-17).

The Ninth National Development Plan (2009–2014) contributed to continuous economic growth, provision of job opportunities, increased income, expansion of infrastructure projects, establishment of basic industries, expansion of public health, and construction of public facilities. It has resulted in continuous improvement of citizen's standard of living and their quality of life. During this period the real economic growth rate averaged 4 per cent. A number of programmes have been implemented aimed at increasing employment of Saudis[[18]](#footnote-18). Saudi Arabia has also achieved all the Millennium Development Goals at the national level. However, since 2015, Saudi Arabia’s fiscal performance was marked by the decrease in government revenues mainly driven by lower oil prices and the war in Yemen.

Despite the progress that Saudi Arabia has made over the past years, a number of challenges remain. These include, diversifying the economy; building Saudi human capacities to lead and participate in the new industrial and service sectors, thereby decreasing reliance on foreign workers; more effectively translating national policies into human development gains through improved governance and public administration; developing capacities to ensure that growth proceeds with equity, with respect to issues of human rights, women, youth, the vulnerable and disabled and in different regions[[19]](#footnote-19); and engaging in global issues of climate change and environment. The adoption and adaptation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will provide an opportunity to ensure integrated policy approaches to address the challenges at hand with clearly defined targets for coordinated implementation.

With the high dependence on the petroleum sector, accounting for roughly 80 per cent of budget revenues, 45 per cent of GDP, and 90 per cent of export earnings, Saudi Arabia is encouraging the diversification of the economy through the growth of the private sector and increasing employment of Saudi nationals. The government is particularly focused on employing the country’s large youth population, primarily in the private sector. In order to create an active and productive private-sector, raising the skills of Saudi workers through education and training is needed.

Saudi Arabia has made a major achievement with regard to the political and economic empowerment of women who account for 20 per cent of members of Shura Council. Women for the first time voted and stood as candidates in municipal elections in December 2015. The voting age was lowered to 18 to allow for more youth participation. 21 women secured municipal councils seats in different regions of the country. The participation of women in the job market is increasing and new work opportunities within the private sector have been opening. The largest portion of Saudis work in the government sector representing 66% of the total employed Saudis, with males constituting about 53% and females about 13%.[[20]](#footnote-20) Although women participation in higher education is high, the unemployment rate amongst women remains at a high 33.3 per cent[[21]](#footnote-21). Unemployment is high among youth gradutes from universities reaching 5% among males and as high as 34% among females in 2014[[22]](#footnote-22). The Gender Inequality Index value is at 0.284 globally ranking at 56[[23]](#footnote-23). Job matching between graduates and industry needs is a challenge.

Among the sweeping changes for improved strategic direction, policy setting and coordination, HM King Salman created a Council of Economic and Development Affairs (CEDA) comprising of 18 ministries and chaired by the Deputy Crown Prince and Minister of Defense. CEDA has taken the lead on an ambitious and transformative agenda with the release, in April 2016, of the Saudi Vision 2030. This important strategy aims to diversify the economy away from its dependence on oil; establish a huge Public Investment Fund through the sale of 5% of ARAMCO; create job opportunities for youth, with equal opportunities for men and women, primarily in the private sector; focusing on the promotion of small and medium enterprises; privatization of national entities, amongst a number of other actions. A National Transformation Plan (NTP) 2020 is launched specifying targets and projects to be implemented by each line ministry.

The UNDP Country Office will be conducting this outcome evaluation in 2016, which should provide a more evidence-based information on UNDP’s contribution to the development results during the 2012-2016 country programme cycle. To achieve the Outcome on***Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy***, the UNDP has focused on enhancing capacities government partners towards national strategy formulation to enhance the economy.

Evaluation PURPOSE

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP’s programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions, especially in the area of sustainable development. The purpose of the proposed evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution to the outcome outlined above with a view to improve on the current and new UNDP programme, providing the most optimal portfolio balance and structure for the next programming cycle (2017-2021). The evaluation should highlight the impact, efficiency, effectiveness and suitability of achievements.

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover UNDP Outcome 3 under the current CPD. This outcome evaluation will assess progress towards the outcome, the factors affecting the outcome, key UNDP contributions to the outcome and assess the partnership strategy.

*Table 1: CPD results and resources framework – Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL:** NDP Objective 3 Sustainable Economic Development; Objective 4 Balanced regional development; Objective 7 Economic Diversification; Objective 8 Knowledge Economy. **UN COUNTY COOPERATION STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (UNCCSF) OUTCOME #1: Inclusive Growth and Employment, #3 Governance. COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME #3:** Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy. **Outcome indicator:** increase in HDI; % share GDP from non-oil sectors; % share GDP from knowledge sectors; % share GDP from private sector-led growth. **Related UNDP Global Strategic Plan focus areas:** Poverty Reduction and Achievement of MDGs. Democratic Governance | | | | | |
| **NATIONAL PARTNER CONTRIBUTION** | **UNDP CONTRIBUTION** | **OTHER PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATOR(S), BASELINES AND TARGET(S) FOR UNDP CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATIVE COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS** | **INDICATIVE RESOURCES BY OUTCOME (US$)** |
| Ministry of Planning progress reports on NDP, consultations for NMDGR, NHDR. Ministry Municipality coordinates Spatial Strategy, observatory network, Rural Dev. Strategy. Tourism Agency sets policies for tourism development. Ministry Commerce policies for trade diversification. Investment Agency plans for economic cities. Government IT sector plans/policies. | UNDP advice for NHDR, NMDGR. UNDP capacity support for statistical systems and 9th NDP M&E. UNDP policy advice to 10th NDP and related policies. UNDP advice for design of NSS, RDS, capacity development for cultural heritage, eco-tourism. UNDP advice for trade and investment. | Chambers of Commerce and industry support diversification policies. DESA, ESCWA, WTO, UNWTO for global expertise. KACST supports development of IT sector innovations like open source software capacities. Global partnerships will be engaged to share experiences among countries. | **Indicator:** HD approach integrated in development policies.  **Baseline:** Trend towards making human development at centre of national development paradigm. **Target:** Clear HD oriented approach to development policy by 2015 with view to sustainability of development results.  **Indicator:** Global best practices integrated into new Spatial Strategy, Rural Strategy, Urban Observatory policies.  **Baseline:** Modest ability of previous strategies to achieve results in geographic balance of development.  **Target:** Strategies serve as effective frameworks for balanced development  **Indicator:** Sustainability integrated in trade, investment, tourism policies.  **Baseline:** Modest trend towards economic diversification beyond oil.  **Target:**  New strategies and capacities accelerate diversification beyond oil export economy. | 9th NDP annual reports. NHDR. NMDGR. 10th NDP  Spatial Strategy. Rural Strategy. Urban Observatory. Network.  Policies, institution capacities for eco-tourism, cultural heritage.  World Trade Service Center. New CSR and investment policies. | **Regular:** Nil |
| **Other:** $20m |

The following projects (See Table 2) have been implemented in the period between late 2012 and 2016 within Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy outcome by UNDP CO in Saudi Arabia.

*Table 2: Projects implemented during the period 2012–2016: Outcome 3: Sustainable Development Mainstreamed across the Economy*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Title | Period |
| 1 | Advisory Services to Ministry of Foreign Affairs | 2010-2017 |
| 2 | Support to Municipal Elections and Post Elections | 2004-2016 |
| 3 | Umbrella Programme for Tourism | 2012-2017 |
| 4 | Sustainable Road and Transport Management | 2012-2016 |
| 5 | Sustainable Development Policy and Planning | 2015-2017 |
| 6 | Riyadh Urban Observatory | 2015-2017 |
| 7 | Support SFDA second strategic plan implementation | 2013-2014 |
| 8 | Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning | 2013-2016 |
| 9 | Advisory Services to Saudi CITC | 2014-2016 |
| 10 | Capacity Development for Gen. Commission for Survey | 2014-2017 |
| 11 | Public Education Evaluation | 2014-2016 |
| 12 | Urban Planning and Management | 2015-2017 |
| 13 | National Open Source Software Resources Center - KACST | 2011-2015 |

Outcome status*:* Determine whether there has been progress made towards the Outcome 3 achievement, and also identify the challenges to attainment of the outcome. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcome.

Underlying factors*:* Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcome. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

Strategic Positioning of UNDP: Examine the distinctive characteristics and features of UNDP’s inclusive development programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a current and potential partner. The Country Office (CO) position will be analyzed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP's relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating value by responding to partners' needs.

Partnership strategy*:* Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership building efforts has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders’ participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the outcome to the country’s needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in development.

Lessons learned: Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas and approaches in incubation, and in relation to management and implementation of activities to achieve the related outcome. This will support learning lessons about UNDP’s contribution to the outcomes over the CPD cycle so as to design a better assistance strategy for the new programming cycle.

Outcome evaluation design should clearly spell out the key questions according to the evaluation criteria against which the subject to be evaluated. The questions when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. The questions cover the following key areas of evaluation criteria:

a) *Relevance: the extent to which the Outcome activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country at the time of formulation:*

Did the Outcome activities design properly address the issues identified in the country?

Did the Outcome objective remain relevant throughout the implementation phase, where a number of changes took place in the development of Saudi Arabia?

Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices of public service based on the principles of governance, public sector performance and participatory decision-making?

Have strategies been launched - including a National Spatial Strategy - for regional balance and specialization, and National Rural Development Strategy for connecting communities to services?

To what degree are approaches such as a human rights based approach to programming, gender mainstreaming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?

b) *Efficiency:* *measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.*

Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost-efficient?

How much time, resources and effort it takes to manage the sustainable development portfolio? Where are the gaps if any?

How did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the performance of the sustainable development portfolio?

c) *Effectiveness:* *the extent to which the Outcome activities attain its objectives*.

How many and which of the outputs are on track by 2016?

What progress toward the Outcome delivery has been made by 2016?

What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended Outcome?

Has UNDP supported the Government to increase accountability, transparency and sensitivity to people needs, especially those who vulnerable?

To what extent has the Cooperation focused on enhancing institutional capacities for results based management and monitoring of NPD results through evidence-based indicator systems at national and local levels including MDG Reports, NHDRs and National and Local Urban Observatory systems?

Has UNDP made impact to improve in transparency and the integrity system of the government?

d) *Sustainability:* *the benefits of the Programme related activities that are likely to continue after the Programme fund has been exhausted*

To what degree have capacities been developed for global partnerships and mechanisms such as MDG review processes and sharing KSA’s development successes with other countries through UN and related conferences and fora?

To what extent have new capacities been developed for expansion of areas of new emphasis like tourism and information technology as well as policies and institutional capacities for shifting to a knowledge economy including the role of New Economic Cities?

How UNDP has contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?

Has follow up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

*Impact:…*

Apart from the criteria above, there are additional commonly applied evaluation criteria such as impact, coverage, connectedness, value-for-money, client satisfaction and protection used in the evaluation, although, not all criteria are applicable to every evaluation. Within the Outcome evaluation there can be additional evaluation questions specified for each the criteria, however all must be agreed with the UNDP in Saudi Arabia. Based on the above analysis, Contractor (herein referred to as evaluation expert) must provide recommendations on how UNDP in Saudi Arabia should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the outcome change is achieved by the end of the CPD and beyond.

Methotology

This section suggests an overall approaches and methods for conducting the evaluation, as well as data sources and tools that will likely yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions. However, the final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluation expert and UNDP about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose, objectives and answers to evaluation questions.

The evaluation expert is encouraged to review the Country Programme Document (CPD) that specifies the outputs, targets and indicators for each component. Based on the objectives and scope mentioned above, the evaluation expert will elaborate a methodology and plan, which will be approved by UNDP and validate information stemmed from contextual sources such as work plans or monitoring reports.

Outcome evaluation will use available data to the greatest extent possible as evidence. This will encompass administrative data as well as various studies and surveys. This approach will help address the possible shortage of data and reveal gaps that should be corrected as the result of the evaluation.

The reliability/availability of disaggregated data should be taken into account as the capacity for data collection at the local level is still developing and it is not possible to conduct comprehensive surveys. In this regard, it is necessary to use objective and subjective data available from the official sources (Central Department of Statistics and Information, data from International Agencies as well as data from various ministries), additionally verified by independent sources such as surveys and studies conducted by local and international research companies, civil society organizations and UN agencies. The relevant sources and access to data will be provided by UNDP and national stakeholders respectively.

The main issues associated with evaluability of some Programme components within Outcome Evaluation might be caused by too general outcome indicators set in the beginning, or their absence. Nonetheless, due to clearly stated overall Country Programme intervention goals and envisaged impact with corresponding indicators there is a certain capacity for data collection, management and analysis in the given Outcome Evaluation. Thus, it is very important to ensure that the Country Programme is evaluable and has an evaluability model that is clearly structured. That, within the model, the goals and objectives are measurable so that the degree to which they have been achieved can be assessed (*i.e. answer the question: what data can be collected that will provide clear evidence that the goals and objectives have been met?*). In general, the indicators allow the evaluator to ensure that the Country Programme is serving those people it intended to reach, that the relevant data is collected in an organized and consistent fashion.[[24]](#footnote-24)

**The Outcome Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the UNDP and all relevant governmental institutions**. Field visits to all project sites; and briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, as well as with partners are envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) whenever possible.

Based on the objectives mentioned above, the evaluation expert will propose a methodology and plan for this assignment, which will be approved by UNDP senior management. An approach relating objectives and/or outcome to indicators, study questions, data required to measure indicators, data sources and collection methods that allow triangulation of data and information often ensure adequate attention is given to all study objectives. However, it’s recommended that the methodology should take into account the following:

The Outcome Evaluation may include, but is not limited to, the following methods of data collection:

* Desk review – review and identify relevant sources of information and conceptual frameworks that exist and are available
* Examination of contextual information and baselines contained in project documents, National Development Plans (9th and 10th) and Vision 2030, National Transformation Plan 2020, Common Country Assessment, UN Common Country Strategic Framework, Country Programme Document, projects’ documents, progress reports, and other sources. These documents speak to the outcome itself, as opposed to what UNDP is doing about it, and how it was envisaged at certain points in time preceding UNDP’s interventions.
* Validation of information about the status of the outcome that is culled from contextual sources such as the CPD, and project progress reports. To do this, consultant may use interviews or questionnaires during the evaluation that seek key respondents’ perceptions on a number of issues, including his/her perception of whether an outcome has changed.
* The current status of and degree of change in the outcome shall be assessed against the Country Analysis and the baselines for the outcome and the indicators and benchmarks used in relation to CPD, relevant project documents, progress and monitoring reports of projects/programs, contextual information from partners.
* Documents and relevant background material on the development context in Saudi Arabia materials, relevant support documents, evaluations, assessments, and a variety of temporal and focused reports. In particular, the annual reports, respective project documents, project reports, Annual Progress Report (APR) In addition, the evaluation expert could review project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluation expert considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.
* Undertake a constructive critique of the outcome formulation itself (and the associated indicators). This is integral to the scope of outcome evaluation. The consultants should make recommendations on how the outcome statement can be improved in terms of conceptual clarity, credibility of association with UNDP operations and prospects for gathering of evidence.
* Critical analysis of available data (its validity and reliability) with regards to the national guiding documents as well as the intended UNDP inputs to the Government of Saudi Arabia.
* Interviews – structured, semi-structured, in-depth, key informant, focus group etc. to capture the perspectives of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, participating ministries, departments, relevant personnel from UNDP and local authorities, other relevant stakeholders and others associated with the Country Programme. Interviews with key informants including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used.
* Information systems – analysis of standardized, quantifiable and classifiable regular data linked to a service or process, used for monitoring.
* Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government, as well as with partners.[[25]](#footnote-25);

Deliverables of the evaluation

The evaluation expert will prepare reports which triangulate findings to address the questions of the Outcome evaluation, highlight key significant changes in regard to the key thematic policy documents, draw out lessons learned, present findings and recommendations, reflecting comments and feedback received from selected staff. It is important to receive the report on a timely basis, as reports will be wasted if they arrive too late to inform decisions.

The structure of the reports should be used to guide the reader to the main areas (please, see Annex II for the evaluation report template). It is expected that the reports should include analysis of the outcome pertaining to women and men throughout the report and that gender analysis is not confined to a separate chapter. The reports should be clear, present well-documented and supported findings, and provide concrete and implementable recommendations. UNDP should be able to share it readily with partners and it should generate consensus around the finding and recommendations. The language of the reports should be simple, free from jargon and with specialist terms explained.

Here are the principal evaluation products the evaluation expert is accountable for following activities and deliverables:

**Evaluation inception report** (*submitted with expression of interest and prepared before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise and consist of 5-10 pages excluding annexes*) – to clarify the evaluation expert’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures (to be presented in an evaluation matrix discussed below). The evaluation inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The evaluation inception report provides with an opportunity to verify that all share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

**Evaluation matrix** (*suggested as a deliverable to be included in the evaluation inception report*) is a tool that evaluation expert creates as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated. (Please, see Table 4 below)

*Table 4. Evaluation matrix*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub-Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data collection Methods / Tools** | **Indicators/ Success Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Draft evaluation report (consist of 50-60 pages excluding annexes) – for revision by UNDP Saudi Arabia at the end of data collection. The draft evaluation report should contain all the sections outlined in the Evaluation Report Template (please, see Annex II) and be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation.

Final evaluation report. The final task of the evaluation expert is to prepare a comprehensive and well-presented copy of the final evaluation report, covering all section of Evaluation Report Template (please, see Annex II) and containing 50-60 pages. Evaluation brief and summary are required. When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluation expert is required also to provide an “audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Implementation arrangements

Evaluation plan

The evaluation expert may not begin data collection until the inception report has been reviewed and cleared. The evaluation expert must develop an Evaluation plan and pilot-test the evaluation instruments. The Evaluation plan is a written document that specifies the evaluation design and details its procedures (what needs to be evaluated, with whom, by whom, when, how).

Once approved by UNDP, the Evaluation plan becomes the key management document for the evaluation, guiding delivery in accordance with expectations of UNDP throughout the performance of the contract. The Evaluation plan can have, but is not limited to, the following sections:

Roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders

Evaluation framework

Evaluation calendar

Evaluation criteria

Types of information needed

Sampling and selection of sources of information

Data collection procedures and methods

Methods for analyzing collected information

In preparing Evaluation plan, the evaluation expert is expected to identify what is feasible taking into consideration the time and effort that people involved must contribute.

Supervision and stakeholders’ involvement

In general, the evaluation expert has independence from organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation. However, UNDP along with Government institutions will have overall responsibility for organizing the Outcome Evaluation and will appoint a focal person/s for coordination in Riyadh. These focal points, with the assistance of UNDP, will backstop and manage the steps involved in planning, implementing and following up the evaluation exercise. On a daily basis, the evaluation expert will work with UNDP and de-brief about the progress of the Outcome Evaluation as needed.

Duty station and logistical modalities

The assignment is home-based with a mission to Saudi Arabia to conduct fieldwork. UNDP will interact with the chosen evaluation expert by communicating through e-mail correspondence while outside of Saudi Arabia, as well as support the evaluation expert in country. There will be an office space, supplies, equipment and materials provided in premises of UNDP.

Evaluation timeframe

The time required will vary depending on the questions the evaluation is attempting to answer, the human and financial resources available, and other external factors. It is important to think through timing issues to ensure that a proposed evaluation is feasible and will provide accurate, reliable, and useful information. It is envisaged that evaluation will take place through April - June 2015 and will involve 35 working days in total (please see the Table 5):

*Table 5. Evaluation timeframe*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Working days |
| Conducting a desk review | 5 |
| Preparing the detailed evaluation inception report ( to finalize evaluation design and methods) | 4 |
| In-country evaluation mission (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires) and 2 days of in country analysis with preliminary feedback to country stakeholders. | 10 |
| Preparing the draft report | 8 |
| Finalizing the evaluation report (incorporate comments provided) | 6 |
| Follow up support to UNDP in knowledge sharing and dissemination | 2 |

*(e.g. 35 working days in total over a period of two months)*

*Eligibility and requirements for the evaluation expert:*

Work experience in conducting independent evaluations,

Experience in M&E, public policy, development studies, economy or a related social science at least 5 years;

Experience in cooperation with, UN, international experts / organizations is an advantage;

Work experience in the region is an advantage.

Knowledge of Arabic language is an asset.

*Required functional competencies for evaluation expert members:*

Possess strong analytical skills and the ability to conceptualize, articulate and debate about local governance and human rights issues with a positive and forward-looking attitude;

Understand human rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming in programming;

Understand results-based management principles, logic modeling/logical framework analysis;

Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively with various partners including government, civil society, private sector, UN Agencies and other development donors;

Excellent organizational and time management skills;

Strong analytical skills and experience in undertaking of similar assignments;

Strong interpersonal skills and ability to work with people from different backgrounds to deliver quality products within a short timeframe;

Excellent report writing skills as well as communication and interviewing skills;

Be flexible and responsive to changes and demands;

Be client oriented and open to feedback.

Required corporate competencies for evaluation expert members:

Sound knowledge of the UNDP programming principles and procedures; the UN system and common country programming processes; the UN evaluation framework, norms and standards; human rights based approach (HRBA);

Demonstrate integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;

Promote the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;

Display cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

Fulfill all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

*Education of evaluation expert members:*

MA or PhD in economics, business administration, political science, public policy, development studies, sociology or a related social science.

*Experience of evaluation expert members:*

5 or more years of relevant professional experience is required, including previous substantive research experience and involvement in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, result-based management.

Experience with quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis; participatory approaches;

Prior monitoring and evaluation experience in the region is an asset.

Knowledge of the social and political situation and regional development trends in Arab and especially GCC countries is an advantage;

*Language Requirements for evaluation expert members:*

Proficiency in English language and proven report writing skills, knowledge of Arabic is an asset.

It is demanded by UNDP that evaluation expert is independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation[[26]](#footnote-26).

Evaluation Expert Ethics

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[27]](#footnote-27) and should describe critical issues evaluation expert must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people, as well as some categories of vulnerable population; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The evaluation expert is also requested to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the UN System’[[28]](#footnote-28)

*Table 6. Payment modalities and specifications*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| 10% | At contract signing (to cover cost related with initiation of the evaluation, i.e. travel, communication etc.) |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the draft evaluation report |
| 50% | Following submission and approval by UNDP of the final evaluation report |

Annexes

*Annex I:* A list of key documents, among others, to be consulted and analyzed:

Country Programme Document

Common Country Assessment

Programme Board meetings

Project Documents

Annual Progress Reports

UNCCSF for 2012-2016

National Development Reports (Ninth and Tenth)

Strategy for Vision 2030

MDGR 2013

Project Annual Reports

UNDP – [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Results](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook)

*Annex II:* Evaluation Report Template

This template is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report. The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’ and ‘Ethical Standards for Evaluations’[[29]](#footnote-29).

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

Title and opening pages — should provide the following basic information:

Name of the evaluation intervention

Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report

Countries of the evaluation intervention

Names and organizations of evaluation experts

Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation

Acknowledgements

Table of contents — should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary — A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.

Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.

Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.

Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction — should:

Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.

Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation, why and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.

Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.

Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.

Description of the intervention — provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.

Explain the expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.

Link the intervention to national priorities, CPD priorities, strategic plan goals, or other programme or country specific plans and goals.

Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.

Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.

Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.

Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.

Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.

Point out design weaknesses (e.g., intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives — the report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.

Evaluation scope — the report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, or outputs were and were not assessed.

Evaluation objectives — the report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.

Evaluation criteria — the report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.

Evaluation questions — Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods — the evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

Data sources — the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.

Data collection procedures and instruments — Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.

Performance standards — the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions. A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader.

Stakeholder engagement — Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

Ethical considerations—the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information)[[30]](#footnote-30).

Background information on evaluation experts — The composition of the evaluation expert, the background and skills of expert members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.

Major limitations of the methodology — Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis — the report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Outcome Results — Overall results (attainment of objectives), Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency, Country ownership, Sustainability, Impact.

Findings and conclusions — the report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

Findings — should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.

Conclusions — should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the outcome

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits

Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Recommendations — the report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned — as appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes — suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

* ToR for the evaluation
* Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
* List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
* List of supporting documents reviewed
* Project or programme results map or results framework
* Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
* Short biography of the evaluation expert
* Code of conduct signed by evaluation experts
* Itinerary

*Annex III*: **Key stakeholders and partners**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Organization | Name and Position of the focal point | Contact information |
| Government partners |  |  |
| Ministry of Foreign Affairs | Mr. Ibrahim Al-Moegil,  National Project Manager | CO: Mr. Ibrahim O. Al-Dhawayan: [idhawayan@mofa.gov.sa](mailto:idhawayan@mofa.gov.sa) |
| Ministry of Economy and Planning | Dr. Salim Al Gudhea, Deputy Minister for Economic Affairs | [salgudhea@mep.gov.sa](mailto:salgudhea@mep.gov.sa) |
| Ministry of Municipal and Rural Affairs | Dr. Abdulrahman Al-Sheikh, Deputy Minister for Town Planning | [mborai@yahoo.com](mailto:mborai@yahoo.com) |
| Ministry of Transport | Eng. Abdulghani Al-Harbi | [Abdulghani.Al-Harbi@mot.gov.sa](mailto:Abdulghani.Al-Harbi@mot.gov.sa) |
| Ministry of Communication and Information Technology | Mr. Sultan Al-Malik – Director PR, Media and International Affairs | [salmalik@mcit.gov.sa](mailto:salmalik@mcit.gov.sa) |
|  |  |  |
| Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage | Dr. Abdulaziz Al-Sheikh,  National Project Coordinator | [abutheebk@scth.gov.sa](mailto:abutheebk@scth.gov.sa) |
| General Commision for Survey | Mr. Mashan Al-Otaibi,  National Project Manager | [mn.alotaibi@gcs.gov.sa](mailto:mn.alotaibi@gcs.gov.sa) |
| Saudi Food and Drug Authority | Mr. Naif Al-Enazi | [NDEnazi@sfda.gov.sa](mailto:NDEnazi@sfda.gov.sa) |
| Public Education Evaluation Commission | Dr. Naif Hashal Al-Roumi - PEEC |  |

*Annex IV:* Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation expert:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluation expert must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluation expert is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluation expert should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluation expert must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluation expert should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[31]](#footnote-31)

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

**Code of conducts signed by the evaluation expert**

**Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

Evaluation expert:

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

**Name of Consultant:**

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

Signed at

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

# Annex 3. List of Reviewed documents

|  |
| --- |
| * Signed ProDoc- Electoral Assistance - 19 September 2004 |
| * Signed PD - Umbrella Programme - Nov 04 |
| * Final Signed MOT PD - 2012-2016 - SIS |
| * Signed English PD for SAU10-79795.pdf |
| * Final PD for Urban Planning and Management 2015-2016 |
| * PD SFDA Second strategic plan 2012-2016 |
| * PD Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning 2013-2014 |
| * PD Advisory Services to Saudi “Communications & Information Technology Commission (CITC)” 2012 -2016 |
| * PD Capacity Development for the General Commission for Survey 2014-2015 |
| * PD PEEC 2014 |
| * OSS Centar 2008-2011 |
| * PD MoFA 2001 |
| * Draft country programme document Saudi Arabia (2012-2016) |
| * Common Country Analysis: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 2015 |
| * Outcome Evaluation Enhanced Policies And Strategies For Sustainable Use Of Natural Resources And Environment |
| * Country programme document for Saudi Arabia (2017-2021) |
| * Advisory services to Saudi Communication & Information Technology Commission (CITC) |
| * Project Status Report for Partners 2014 |
| * Report: Support for Policy Analysis and Strategic Planning **2007** |
| * Meeting notes: Support for Policy Analysis in Saudi Arabia (Phase III) |
| * The meeting took place on 27 May 2009 |
| * Board Meeting report: SCTA meeting in January 2012 |
| * APR Urban Planing for 2012 |
| * Quarterly report for MOEP January – June 2014 |
| * Bord Meeting Report: Sustainable development planning (January 2015) |
| * PD Public Transport Authority 2012-2016 |
| * APR Support to Developing National Youth Strategy in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Dec 2015) |
| * APR SFDA 2015 |
| * APR 2015 Sustainable Road and Transport Management |
| * APR AU 10-83995: Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning 2015 |
| * 2015 Umbrella Programme for the Saudi Commission for Tourism and Antiquities (SCTA) |
| * APR 20-15 Public Education Evaluation Commission (PEEC) |
| * Project Board Meeting March 2012 - Technical Support to Municipal Elections and Post Elections |
|  |
| **Links** |
| * Link to the ninth development plan: <http://www.mep.gov.sa/en/knowledge-resources/> |
| * Link to Vision 2030 and NTP 2020:  <http://vision2030.gov.sa/en> |
| * Link to SDGs: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs> |

# Annex 4. List of interviewed persons

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Institution** |
| Firas Gharaibeh | Deputy Resident Representative | UNDP |
| Mayssam Tamim | Assistant Resident Representative | UNDP |
| Asim Saleh | Senior Programme Associate | UNDP |
| Yassin Yassin | Programme Officer | UNDP |
| Dr. Saleh Alshumani, | Deputy Governor | PEEC |
| Mr. Naif Al-Anazi | Project Steering Committee Member | PEEC |
| Mr. Abdulrahman Al-Kharji | Project Finance | PEEC |
| Mr. Saleh H. Al Hathloul | Executive Assistant President of Shared Services | SFDA |
| Mr. Abdulaziz Al-Hunaki | Finance Director | SFDA |
| Mr. Abdulrahman Al-Debyan | Head of Accounts | SFDA |
| Dr. Stephane Dreher | Transport Data and Statistics Advisor | Ministry of Transport |
| Sorin Honc | Transport and Logistics Advisor | Ministry of Transport |
| Dr Suleiman S. Abu-Kharmeh | Chief Technical Advisor | MoMRA |
| François Libeau | Expert | UNDP |

# Annex 5. Overview of budget allocations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | **Title** | **Agreed budget (per PD)** | **Actual utilised budget for ongoing projects/final budget expenditure (for finalised)** | **Comment (why budget change happened, amendments, etc.)** | |
|  | Overall budget for Outcome 3 | 20 Million (as per CPD) |  |  | |
| 1 | Advisory Services to Ministry of Foreign Affairs | $3,000,000 |  |  | |
| 2 | Support to Municipal Elections and Post Elections | $1,466,391 | $1,466,391 + 130,000 | This increase of 130,000 was conceived to evaluate results of the municipal elections with the objective of drawing lessons for next round of elections; and to building consensus on the analysis recommendations of the municipal elections evaluation | |
| 3 | Umbrella Programme for Tourism | $8,000,000 | $14,400,000 | A budget increase of 8 million for 2015 was executed to  formulate and implement the national tourist training programme and to develop the legal framework to encourage investment promotion in the tourism industry at the national level. | |
| 4 | Sustainable Road and Transport Management | $7,046,746 | $9,823,471 | The reason of Budget change was to set out initial project personnel to render support to the extent of tasks for NTS implementation and for comprehensive planning procedures | |
| 5 | Sustainable Development Policy and Planning | $10,162,550 |  |  | |
| 6 | Riyadh Urban Observatory | $250,000 | $950,000 | A new phase of project was signed on 17 May 2016 with the key objective to expand coverage of urban indicators from city-level to the region-level. | |
| 7 | Support SFDA second strategic plan implementation | $17,759,492 | $18,761,992 | The purpose of this revision wasis to add a new output to SFDA project with the aim to ensure capacity development (both institutional and Individual) to SFDA personnel with the aim to serve various geographical areas of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.  Said training to be provided by USDA in the areas that are listed in the TAA which provide technical services and training activities in key areas to enhance SFDA’s food safety platform |
| 8 | Socio-Economically Effective Human Development Planning | $6,266,667 | $6,266,667 |  | |
| 9 | Advisory Services to Saudi CITC | $2,863,823 | $2,863,823 | 0 increase | |
| 10 | Capacity Development for Gen. Commission for Survey | $2,533,333 | $4,533,333 | An output was added, targeting capacity development to the aerial survey division through the team of UNDP’s advisors at the project. This output also envisages developing the national capacity for ground verification of the aerial survey products, including formulation of required institutional systems to link the aerial survey products with the GIS database at the General Commission for Survey. | |
| 11 | Public Education Evaluation | $2,118,900 | $6,609,655 | The budget was increased due to include the needed funds to support developing the licensing system for education practitioners and teachers. The project will sign a contract with six international experts and attract a number of Saudi experts to build and develop The National Standard Framework of Teachers in Saudi Arabia, in addition to developing required materials to support applying the standards and link them to teachers and their performance in the classroom | |
| 12 | Urban Planning and Management | $2,666,667 | No Information |  | |
| 13 | National Open Source Software Resources Center - KACST | $1,330,350 | $1,330,350 | 0 Increase | |

1. SMART stand for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound. These are the standard criteria used for definition of indicators in a result framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Outputs that were not tackled by projects within the CPD (CSR, Rural strategy, World Trade Service Centre, policies, institution capacities for eco-tourism) are not included [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://www.mep.gov.sa/themes/Dashboard/index.jsp> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://cdsi.gov.sa/english/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=160>) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://www.indexmundi.com/saudi_arabia/demographics_profile.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Human Development Report, 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://www.mol.gov.sa/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UN Common Country Analysis - Saudi Arabia December 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Saudi Economic report 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <http://www.sama.gov.sa/en-US/EconomicReports/AnnualReport/5600_R_Annual_En_51_Apx.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Saudi Economic Report for 2014, Ministry of Economy and Planning [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/GII> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Outcome evaluation of UNDP support for: Social Empowerment and Institutional Strengthening with Emphasis on Youth Country Programme 2012-2016 and Outcome Evaluation of Outcome II: Enhanced Policies and strategies for sustainable use of natural resources and the environment [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. <http://www.mep.gov.sa/themes/Dashboard/index.jsp> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <http://cdsi.gov.sa/english/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=160>) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. <http://www.indexmundi.com/saudi_arabia/demographics_profile.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. UNDP Human Development Report, 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. <https://www.mol.gov.sa/> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. UN Common Country Analysis - Saudi Arabia December 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Saudi Economic report 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. <http://www.sama.gov.sa/en-US/EconomicReports/AnnualReport/5600_R_Annual_En_51_Apx.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Saudi Economic Report for 2014, Ministry of Economy and Planning [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/GII> [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Please see more on Evaluability: *The Justice Research and Statistics Association. Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation. Source:* [*http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf*](http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. The list of main stakeholders is provided in Annex III; nonetheless, the list of the partners could be expanded upon the request of the evaluation expert if deemed necessary. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. For this reason, staff members of UNDP based in other country offices, the regional centers and Headquarters units should not be part of the evaluation expert. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Please see, Annex IV [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. UNEG, ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’, 2005, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/unegstandards> and UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008, available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. For more information on Code of Conduct please visit: [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-31)