



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Closing Date: 31st May 2016

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Country: India

Description of the assignment: National Consultant for TERMINAL Evaluation (TE) (*Refer Annex.A for details*)

Project name: Sustainable Urban Transport Project

Location: Home based Consultancy. Travel to be done as per assignment.

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 25 working days

Important Note-Applications without financial proposal would not be considered.

Proposals should be submitted on line latest by 31st May 2016. Please do not send proposals directly through email and strictly apply on line. **Also note who applied earlier for the said position need not apply.**

Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the e-mail ranjan.sinha@undp.org strictly mentioning **National Consultant for TERMINAL Evaluation (TE) of Sustainable Urban Transport Project** in the subject line. The Procurement unit will respond by standard electronic mail. **Submission of technical and financial proposal is requested instead of resume, the technical and financial proposal must be clubbed in one file.**

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

1. BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **Sustainable Urban Transport Project**.

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

Please refer to Annex A - Terms of Reference.

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Refer to item no. 13 – Team Composition under Annex A - Terms of Reference

4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Technical Proposal:

- (i) Explaining why they are the most suitable candidate for the work (max. 4 pages)
- (ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work (if applicable) (max. 1 page)

2. Financial proposal

- (i) Professional rate per day, total days and the total professional cost
- (ii) Detailed CV

5. Special instructions for completing the financial proposal

Travel: All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

6. EVALUATION

IC proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Cumulative analysis:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the IC whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight - 70%

* Financial Criteria weight - 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

| Criteria | Weight |
|---|---------------|
| <u>Technical</u> | |
| • Qualification of the Consultant | 20 |
| • Relevant work Experience | 40 |
| • Proposed Work Plan for undertaking the task | 10 |
| <u>Financial</u> | 30 |

ANNEX A- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR – INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT (NATIONAL)

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **Sustainable Urban Transport Project**.

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

2. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Project Title: | Sustainable Urban Transport Project | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 3241 (GEF PMIS #) | | <i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$) | <i>at completion</i> (Million US\$) |
| UNDP Project ID: | 3214 (UNDP PIMS #) 00059078 (Atlas ID) | GEF financing: | \$4,050,000 | |
| Country: | India | IA/EA own: | | |
| Region: | Asia and Pacific | Government: | \$62,130,000 | |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other (Financing Institutions & Promoters): | Participating States and Cities \$107,908,792 World Bank(loan) \$104,970,000 | |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Total co-financing: | \$62,130,000 | |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | \$297,508792 | |
| Other Partners involved: | N/A | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | April 15, 2010 | |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: Dec 31, 2014 | Actual: March 31, 2018 |

3. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

In order to achieve the project objective, the project key Components and Outcomes are as follows.

Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities

The objective of this project is to reduce the growth trajectory of GHG emissions from the transport sector in India through the promotion of environmentally sustainable urban transport, strengthening government capacity to plan, finance, implement, operate and manage climate friendly and sustainable urban transport interventions at national, state and city levels, and increasing the modal share of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities. There are two main components: one on national capacity development initiatives, which is being managed by UNDP, and another on demonstration projects in certain selected cities (currently five in number), which is being managed by the World Bank.

The UNDP-managed component on national capacity development initiatives was expected to create an enabling institutional framework for sustainable urban transport in India by institutionalizing environmental principles in urban transport policy, planning, implementation, operations and management. This is being accomplished by:

- i. initiating, building and consolidating a strong and functional long-term partnership between Government of India and States/Local Governments for sustainable urban transport development;
- ii. enhancing the capacity of policymakers, planners, researchers, executive agencies, service providers, managers and other professionals involved in urban transport to plan, implement, operate and manage sustainable urban transport systems; and
- iii. Creating a national resource center for urban transport which would facilitate knowledge and information exchange.
- iv. The enabling institutional framework for sustainable urban transport will be achieved through the implementation of the following components:

Component 1A: This component has following four sub-components:

Sub-Component 1.1: Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT);

Sub-Component 1.2: Individual Capacity Development through training of trainers and of a group of about 1,000 professionals at national, state, and city levels.

Sub-Component 1.3: Selection and preparation of Manuals and Toolkits;

Sub-Component 1.3a: Needs assessment and identification of Manuals and Toolkits

Sub-Component 1.3b: Preparation of Manuals, Standards and Tool Kits

Sub-Component 1.4: Promotion, awareness-raising, and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP

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

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

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The international consultant will be the team leader and coordinate the evaluation process to ensure quality of the report and its timely submission. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The

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

evaluation team is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex D](#)). The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, Project Management Unit, and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission as indicated in section 4 of this Procurement Notice i.e. Financial Proposal (page 2). Interviews will be held with the following individuals and organizations at a minimum, but not limited to:

- Relevant personnel at UNDP Country Office in New Delhi, India and Program Officer in-charge of the Project
- National Project Director (NPD)
- National Project Coordinator (NPC)
- Project Management Unit (PMU)
- Relevant project stakeholders but not limited to Institute of Urban Transport, Mott Mc Donalds etc.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, inception workshop report, annual work and financial plans, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR (until 2015), project budget revisions, quarterly reports, Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings, Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any), Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc., midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment such as terms of reference for past consultants’ assignments and summary of the results; past audit reports (if any). A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex C](#) of this Terms of Reference.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex B](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex E](#).

| Evaluation Ratings: | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation | <i>rating</i> | 2. IA& EA Execution | <i>rating</i> |
| M&E design at entry | | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) | |
| Overall quality of M&E | | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes | <i>rating</i> | 4. Sustainability | <i>rating</i> |
| Relevance | | Financial resources: | |
| Effectiveness | | Socio-political: | |
| Efficiency | | Institutional framework and governance: | |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | | Environmental : | |
| | | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | |

6. PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

| Co-financing (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US\$) | | Government (mill. US\$) | | Partner Agency (mill. US\$) | | Partner Agency (mill. US\$) | | Total (mill. US\$) | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loans/Concessions | | | | | | | | | | |
| • In-kind support | | | | | | | | | | |
| • Other | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |

7. MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluation will examine this project's contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

8. IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

9. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **New Delhi, India**. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Throughout the period of evaluation, the evaluation team will liaise closely with the Programme Officer/ Adviser/Project Manager, the concerned agencies of the Government, any members of the international team of experts under the project and the counterpart staff assigned to the project. The team can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfil its task, the team, however, is not authorized to make any commitments to any part on behalf of UNDP/GEF or the Government.

Logistics

The team will conduct a mission visit to New Delhi and selected project sites, to meet with relevant project stakeholders. This visit will also include meetings with the officials of UNDP, the Implementing Partner, stakeholders from other institutions and ministries related to the project.

After the initial briefing by UNDP CO, the review team will meet with the National Project Director (NPD), National Project Coordinator (NPC) and the GEF Operational Focal Point as required.

11. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

| Activity | Working Days | Completion Date |
|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Preparation | 5 days | 1 st July, 2016 |
| Evaluation Mission | 10 days | 18 th July, 2016 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 7 days | 3 rd August, 2016 |
| Final Report | 3 days | 17 th August, 2016 |

12. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report | Full report including TT sheet calculations, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 7 days of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFFs |
| Final Report* | Revised report | Within 3 days of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

13. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluator³. The individual experts in the team need to have good technical knowledge Urban Transport sector and its national context, and program/project implementation in India, possess good evaluation experience, and writing skills to carry out the assignment. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for quality and timely submission of the report. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The national consultant must present the following qualifications and professional background:

- Minimum of eight years accumulated and recognized professional experience Urban Transport and climate change projects, and knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management in climate change projects and community development

³ Also called consultant

- Knowledge of Urban Transport policies/conditions in India and abroad through implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of donor funded projects
- Post-Graduate degree in Transport planning, Management or Business administration;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported urban transport projects;
- Very good report writing skills in English.

The evaluation team shall conduct debriefing for the UNDP Country Office, NPD, NPC, Project Management Unit, in India towards the end of the evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead presentation of the draft review findings and creating the recommendations, and shall lead the drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation.

13. EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex F) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

14. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

ANNEX B: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome | Description of Indicator | Baseline Level | Target Level at end of project |
|---|---|--|---|
| Project Development Objective and Global Environment Objective: to promote environmentally sustainable urban transport in India and to improve the usage of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities. | The number of cities that develop an identifiable urban transport planning process (i.e., managed by professional units/institutions of government, following certain procedures and guidance, and involving various level of analytical work and stakeholders' participation) increases, by project end. | None of the project cities has an urban transport planning process | All project cities have an identifiable urban transport planning process in place |
| | Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) provides technical assistance to a number of states in implementing various provisions of National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) | N/A | 7 cites |
| | IUT provides training and advisory services to a number of project cities (5 nos), and non-project cities (5 nos) in implementing various provisions of NUTP. | N/A | 10 cities (5 project and 5 non-project cities) |
| Outcome 1: Institute of Urban Transport strengthened to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy | Business Plan developed to strengthen IUT | NA | Business Plan developed, implemented to strengthen IUT |
| | Certification of IUT to serve as accreditation body on Sustainable Urban Transport | 0 | 1 |

| Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome | Description of Indicator | Baseline Level | Target Level at end of project |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| | Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMC) operational at IUT | NA | KMC Operational by end of 2015 |
| | IUT's knowledge management database is established and operational | 0 | 1 |
| | Trial validity data of cities entered into KMC | 0 | 46 |
| | Validation of SLB cities data into KMC | 0 | 12 |
| | Policy research conducted by IUT for MoUD | 0 | 6 |
| | Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed with International institutions to build knowledge and expertise of IUT to sustain the capacity building activities after SUTP project ends | 0 | 3 |
| | IUT appraised Comprehensive Mobility Plan (CMP) for cities are approved by MOUD under JnNURM | 0 | 65 |
| | Institutionalizing corpus support for operation of IUT's business plan by MoUD | NA | MOUD provides one time financial corpus to IUT to maintain the required human and financial resources to function as Technical expert on Urban Transport. |
| | IUT signs Memorandum of Understanding with states to provide technical support and advisory services on urban transport. | 0 | 7 |
| | Preparation of Service Level Benchmark (SLB) for cities by IUT | 0 | 15 |
| | Number of DPR evaluations carried out by IUT for MoUD on all technical aspects of urban transport. | 0 | 65 |
| Outcome 2: | Number of master trainers trained on variou | 0 | 100 |

| Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome | Description of Indicator | Baseline Level | Target Level at end of project |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Government officials, urban planners, practitioners receive training on various aspects of sustainable urban transport. | topics of sustainable urban transport | | |
| | Number of training programmes conducted for Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops | 0 | 5 |
| | Number of trainings by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 40 |
| | Training provided by IUT on thematic areas for transport sector professionals | 0 | 5 thematic trainings 2 topical trainings |
| | Number of people trained by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 1000 |
| Outcome 3: Manuals, Toolkits and Standard prepared to serve as reference documents, guides to develop and implement of sustainable urban transport. | Sustainable urban transport training manuals developed by IUT | 0 | 10 |
| | Toolkits developed by IUT | 0 | 15 |
| | Number of validation workshops conducted by IUT to test the developed training manuals and toolkits | 0 | 15 |
| Outcome 4: Increased awareness of Sustainable Urban Transport interventions among city government officials and transport sector professionals. | Quarterly newsletters published and circulated by the PMU | 0 | 20 |
| | Number of press releases and brochures about the project disseminated | 0 | 2 |
| | SUTP web portal developed, launched and periodically updated by PMU | 0 | 1 |

| Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome | Description of Indicator | Baseline Level | Target Level at end of project |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------------------|
| | IUT organizes one annual international conference | 0 | 4 |
| | Experience and knowledge sharing workshop for cities and state governments organized by PMU | 0 | 3 |

ANNEX C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Document
- Inception Workshop Report
- Annual Work and Financial Plans
- Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) reports until 2012;
- GEF Focal Area tracking tools at baseline, midterm, and terminal points of the project
- Midterm Review (MTR)

- Quarterly Reports
- Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings
- Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any)
- Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.
- Baseline reports, consultancy inputs for implementation, post commissioning measurement studies, etc.
- Knowledge products UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX D: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

| Evaluative Criteria | Questions | Indicators | Sources ⁴ | Methodology ⁵ |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to National priorities and commitment under international conventions? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project country-driven? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective is the project in terms of supporting and facilitating transport sector | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design and ownership in project implementation? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project internally coherent in its design? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Even after one extension, does the project achieve its expected outcomes? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project made satisfactory accomplishment in achieving project outputs vis-à-vis the targets and related delivery of inputs and activities? | • | • | • |

⁴ Various sources, but not limited to project document, project reports, national policies & strategies, key project partners & stakeholders, needs assessment studies, data collected throughout monitoring and evaluation, data reported in project annual & quarterly reports etc.

⁵ Various methodologies, but not limited to Data analysis, Documents analysis, Interviews with project team, Interviews with relevant stakeholders etc.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? | • | • | • |
| Effectiveness: The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the performance measurement indicators and targets used in the project monitoring system are accomplished and able to achieve desired project outcomes within 31st December 2015? | • | See indicators in logframe listed in project document (or Annex B) | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of recommendations and reporting of information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project consider Midterm Review recommendations conducted on time and reflected in the subsequent project activities Reporting of the petroleum fuels and the power reduction in each of the model units from implementing eco- tech options and the corresponding carbon emission reductions. | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes could have been made (if any) to the project design in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? | • | • | • |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards and delivered results with the least costly resources possible? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was project support provided in an efficient way? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system were operating as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making? | • | • | • |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective was the adaptive management practiced under the project and lessons learnt? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilization of resources (including human and financial) towards producing the outputs and adjustments made to the project strategies and scope. | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of co-funding provided (Ministry of Urban Development, Gol and Financing Units) and its impact on the activities (Refer to Table in section 6. Project Finance / Co-Finance). | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness of the institutional arrangement and whether there was adequate commitment to the project? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is technical assistance and support received from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely specifically for project PMU? | • | • | • |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project be sustainable on its conclusion and stimulate replications and its potential? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective is the project in terms of strengthening the capacity of transport professionals | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was an exit strategy prepared and implemented by the project? What is the "Expected situation at the end of the Project" as envisioned at the time of terminal evaluation? | • | • | • |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness of the institutional arrangement and whether there was adequate commitment to the project. | • | • | • |

| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress towards maximizing environmental benefits? | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the project impact under different components | To what extent has the project contributed to the following? (a) Institutional Arrangements Strengthened (b) Effective Information Dissemination Program Developed (c) Stakeholders capacity enhanced | • | Use key indicators in logframe listed in project document (or Annex B) | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the indirect benefits that can be attributed to the project? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the spinoffs created by the project, if any, as a result of the various workshops held nationwide, toolkits, case studies developed? | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts due to information dissemination under the project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the dissemination activities facilitate the progress towards project impacts? | • | • | • |

ANNEX E: RATING SCALES

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) Moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p> | <p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p> | <p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> |
| <p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p> | | |

Evaluators:

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

| |
|---|
| Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁶ |
| 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 <i>place</i> on <i>date</i> |
| Signature: _____ |

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁸)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings⁹
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁰)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

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

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ At its discretion, the evaluation team is free to include any other additional information that is felt worth reporting. Considering that UNDP is concerned about poverty reduction, local governance and promotion of gender equity, the team may look at these cross-cutting issues and comment if the project had any linkages and any achievement on these objectives. This may also include contribution to “development dividends”, which may refer to ways in which a project contributes towards: (a) Achievement of the MDGs, (b) Improvements to people’s livelihoods, (c) Inter-generational poverty reduction, and (d) Improvements in the quality of life. Such development dividends can be accrued either locally or nationally.

¹⁰ See Annex E for rating scales.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
 - Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
 -
- 3.3 Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Impact
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
5. Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Completed tracking tool
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* GEF Focal Area Terminal Tracking Tool

ANNEX H: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Advisor based on the region and included in the final document.)

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by | |
| UNDP Country Office | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
| UNDP GEF RTA | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |

ANNEX I: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

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

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

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

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