Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF 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 thePakistan Sustainable Transport (PAKSTRAN) project (Project ID: 00072773; PIMS No. 3953).The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **“Pakistan Sustainable Transport PAKSTRAN Project”** | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00072773 | **Project financing** |  | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 00058561 | GEF financing: | $ 4,800,000 | $ 4,800,000 |
| Country: | Pakistan | UNDP contribution: | $ 3,000,000 | $ 3,000,000 |
| Region: | Asia | Government: |  |  |
| Focal Area: | Sustainable Transport System | Other: |  |  |
|  |  | Total co-financing: |  |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Water & Power, Government of Pakistan | Total Project Cost in cash: | $ 7,800,000 | $7,800,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | * UNDP/GEF * Government of Punjab * Government of Sindh * Ministry of Communications * IUCN | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | June 2012 |
|  | Planned closing date:  30 September 2017  (as per MTR) | Revised closing date:  31 December 2016 |

Objective and Scope

Pakistan Sustainable Transport (PAKSTRAN) project (Project ID: 00072773; PIMS No. 3953) is an initiative of UNDP-GEF & Government of Pakistan that aims to provide technical assistance to reduce the growth of energy consumption & related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transport sector in Pakistan, while simultaneously improving urban environmental conditions and improving Pakistan’s trade competitiveness.

The global objective of PAKSTRAN is to reduce the GHG emissions from transport sector in Pakistan. However, the developmental objectives of PAKSTRAN are: to improve urban environmental conditions (i.e. improved air quality, urban mobility, equity, city aesthetics); and to improve energy security for Pakistan.

The project is funded by UNDP/GEF (total budget is US$ 7.8 million with US$ 3.0 million from UNDP & US$ 4.8 million from GEF). The project was started by UNDP/GEF and Government of Pakistan in June 2012, which (as per MTR) was expected to be completed on September 30, 2017. However, project is now closing on 31st December 2016 as per the advice of UNDP/GEF.

Ministry of Water and Power is the Implementing Partner (IP) of the project (Ref: Office Memorandum, dated February 6, 2014 issued by the Ministry of Water & Power, Islamabad). Earlier, ENERCON was the IP of the project.

Moreover, the project has four components (to achieve outcomes), which are given below:

**Outcome 1:** An operational sustainable urban transport system in Punjab province (Punjab P&D Department is the Responsible Partner-RP to achieve this outcome);

**Outcome 2:** An operational sustainable urban transport system in Sindh province (Sindh Transport Department is the Responsible Partner-RP to achieve this outcome);

**Outcome 3:** Improved fuel efficiency in truck freight transport (Ministry of Communications is the Responsible Partner-RP for this outcome; &

**Outcome 4:** Increased public awareness and institutional capacity on sustainable transport concepts (IUCN-Pakistan is the Responsible Partner-RP for this outcome).

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is established in Islamabad. Moreover, Component Implementation Unit (CIU)-Punjab, Component Implementation Unit (CIU)-Sindh, Component Implementation Unit Trucking (CIU-Trucking) and Component Implementation Unit (CIU)-IUCN are based at Lahore, Karachi and Islamabad respectively.

The organization structure of PAKSTRAN project (amended; as per Office Memorandum, dated February 6, 2014 issued by the Ministry of Water & Power, Islamabad) is given below:
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Management arrangements mentioned in PAKSTRAN Project Document, demanded for establishing a Project Board (PB) in accordance with the relevant provisions of Government of Pakistan & UNDP Project Cycle Operations Manual (PCOM). Therefore, Ministry of Water and Power, Govt. of Pakistan vide Notification No. Ent.13 (9)/2011-Enercon dated 19-02-2014 reconstituted the Project Board of PAKSTRAN (Ministry of Water and Power is the IP.

The key functions of the Project Board (PB) are to provide the project oversight and strategic advice to the project, and to approve Annual Work Plan and Annual Budget of PAKSTRAN project. The PB is also responsible for making any management decisions for PAKSTRAN.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an TE 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 GEFoperational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Lahore and Karachi*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: NPD and NPM of PAKSTRAN, Component Manager and Component Director CIU-Sindh, Component Manager and Component Director CIU-Punjab, Component Manager and Component Director CIU-Trucking, and Component Manager and Component Director CIU-IUCN.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PRs, project budget revisions, midterm review, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:)of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry | (6 point scale) | Quality of UNDP Implementation– Implementing Agency (IA) | (6 point scale) |
| M&E Plan Implementation | (6 point scale) | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) | (6 point scale) |
| Overall quality of M&E | (6 point scale) | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | (6 point scale) |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance | (2 point R/NR scale) | Financial resources: | (4 point scale) |
| Effectiveness | (6 point scale) | Socio-political: | (4 point scale) |
| Efficiency | (6 point scale) | Institutional framework and governance: | (4 point scale) |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | (6 point scale) | Environmental: | (4 point scale) |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | (4 point scale) |

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$) | | GEF  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 3 | 0.7 | 4.8 | 4.04 |  |  | 7.8 | 4.74 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| * Government |  |  |  |  | 64.36 | 0 | 64.36 | 0 |
| * World Bank |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| * JICA |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 0 | 2.3 | 0 |
| * Provinces |  |  |  |  | 1.56 | 0 | 1.56 | 0 |
| Totals | 3 | 0.7 | 4.8 | 4.04 | 70.22 | 0 | 78.02 | 4.74 |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF 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 was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

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 urban transport systems, b) verifiable reductions in GHG emissions as a result of BRT systems in country, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Pakistan*.*The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30days over a time period of three monthsaccording to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 03 days | *15th November 2016* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15*days | *30th November 2016* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *07*days | *7th December 2016* |
| **Final Report** | *05* days | *12th December 2016* |

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, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, AFOFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week 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. An audit trail template is available in Annex H.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 International Evaluator (team leader)[[3]](#footnote-3)and 1 National Evaluator.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience working in sustainable transport, climate change mitigation, and related fields;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in evaluation of similar kind of projects.
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Transport, Sustainability and related fields;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in climate change related discipline, environmental science/management, transport, urban planning or other closely related field.

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online on the following link:

<http://www.pk.undp.org/content/pakistan/en/home/operations/procurement0/>

by1st November 2016. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in Englishwith indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

Results and Resources Framework

| **Expected Results (Outcomes & Outputs)** | **Sub-Output and Indicators** | | **Baseline** | **Targets** | **Source/Method of Collection** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **Indicative Budget** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Project Objective/ Atlas Output**  Reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission associated with urban transportation | **Atlas Output**  Reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission associated with urban transportation  **Indicator 1:** Cumulative, direct GHG emission reductions in the urban transport sector compared to BAU scenario over a 20-year period, ktonnes | | **Baseline 1**: 0 ktonnes CO2 | **Target 1:**608 ktonnes CO2 (direct reduction from BRT demonstrations) | Reports of BRT demonstrations including surveys and field observations of ridership switches from car to public transport | 1. Reliable data obtained from carrying out physical surveys related to ridership switching from car to public transport.  2. Continued good support from all stakeholders for implementation of planned monitoring and evaluation activities. | Regular: $3,000,000 Other (GEF): $4,800,000 |
| **Indicator2:**  Cumulative, direct GHG emission reductions from a pilot scheme to modernize the trucking fleet compared to BAU scenario over a 10-year period, ktonnes | | **Baseline 2:** 0 ktonnes CO2 | **Target 2:** 5 ktonnes CO2 (direct reduction from truck modernization program) | Fuel efficiency reports including surveys and field observations from pilot truck modernization program on improved | 1. Reliable data obtained from carrying out physical surveys related to fuel consumption of modern energy efficient trucks.  2. Continued good support from all stakeholders for implementation of planned monitoring and evaluation activities. |
|  | |  | | | | | |
| **Output -1** Operational Sustainable Urban Transport System in Punjab Province | **Sub- Output 1.1:** Feasibility plans for a demonstration integrated BRT system in selected cities in Punjab Province  **Indicator 1:** Number of completed feasibility plans prepared for BRT in Punjab  **Indicator 2:** No of public private financing secured based on the selected feasibility study (IPDF and ECF) | | **Baseline 1:** No complete feasibility plan on BRT is available in Punjab  **Baseline 2:** No public private financing for completed feasibility plans in Punjab | **Target 1:** 2 feasibility plans augmented for BRT in Lahore and Rawalpindi  **Target 2:** 1 Public private financing secured based in one city in Punjab | Specific plans&evaluation related to the feasibility studies/plans. | Firm support from Government of Punjab and all related stakeholders. | Regular: $684,299 Other (GEF): $1,093,101 |
| **Sub-Output 1.2:** Plans for implementing demonstration integrated BRT system  **Indicator 1**: Extent to which effective capacity building programmes for UU developed and implemented  **Indicator 2:** Number of approved integrated BRT implementation plans for selected cities in Punjab Province. | | **Baseline-1**: Lack of holistic planning for integrated BRT system in Punjab  **Baseline-2:** No approved integrated BRT implementation plans for selected cities in Punjab*.* | **Target 1:** No of feasibility studies from output 1.1 being upgraded to holistic BRT implementation plan for the BRT system.  **Target 2:** 2 approved implementation plans for integrated BRT system in 2 cities of Punjab | Specific studies/plans and evaluation related to the plans for implementing demonstration integrated BRT system, spot checking and visits | Reliable data obtained and  Continued good support from all stakeholders. |
| Sub-Output 1.3Infrastructure for demonstration BRT system  Indicator 1: Number of capacity development programmes developed and implemented for city district government/govt. agencies and local engineering firms  Indicator 2: Extent to which the capacity development programmes have been effective. | | **Baseline-1:** No related capacity development programmes developed for city district government/govt. agencies and local engg. firms  **Baseline-2**: No related capacity development programmes implemented for city district government/govt. agencies and local engg. firms | Target 1: No of capacity development programmes for city government/govt. agencies and local engineering firms in engineering, construction, operations and management of BRT system | Specific studies/manuals, evaluation, field observations and surveys, spot checking.  Number of capacity building training manuals for specific programmes | BRT design and construction standards are adopted and implemented by the Govt. of Punjab in true letter and spirit |
| Sub-Output 1.4: An operational demonstration BRT system  Indicator 1: Number of institutions with enhanced capacity to operate, maintain, and manage a BRT system  Indicator 2: Cumulative GHG reductions from the BRT demos in 02 cities of Punjab- ktonnes CO2   1. Indicator 3: Cumulative energy savings generated by BRT pilot demonstration 2. Indicator 4: % increase in public transit ridership 3. Indicator 5: Methodology and M&E plan designed for the measurement of the specific energy and emission parameters | | Baseline 1: No fully operational demo BRT system  Baseline 2:No decline in GHG emissions due to lack of institutional coordination within the Govt. of Punjab (0 ktonnes CO2)  Baseline 3: No energy saving calculations available  Baseline 4: No calculations of public transit ridership  Baseline 5: No methodology and M&E plan available for the measurement of specific energy and emission parameters | Target 1: One operational BRT system with no. of institutions having enhanced capacity to operate, maintain, and manage a BRT system  Target 2: 20,280 tonnes of CO2 reduced by the BRT demonstration   1. Target 3: 1000 toe of energy saved from BRT demonstration   **Target 4:** 8% increase in public transit ridership  Target 5: M&E plan (including methodology) development for calculating energy & emission savings | Surveys, specific studies/SOPs/NEQs, evaluation, field observations, interviews, spot checks | Activities planned are fully supported and implemented by the Government of Punjab and all stakeholders |
| **Sub- Output 1.5:** Strengthened institutional framework that enables holistic urban transport development.  **Indicator 1:** Number of institutional framework developed to facilitate holistic urban transport planning in Punjab | | Baseline 1: No institutional framework related to BRT developed in Punjab | Target 1: New policy framework proposing & stream-lining the reporting lines, responsibilities and accountability for each relevant agencies (Punjab Govt, and other institutions) | Specific tools, plans, policies/planning and management exercise based on advanced research, evaluation, field observations and spot checking | Harmony amongst all stakeholders and Punjab Government willingness and strong commitment. |
| **Sub- Output 1.6:**  Punjab Provincial Government integrated urban transport plan  **Indicator 1:** Number of strategic integrated urban transport plans  Indicator 2: Number of Provincial policy for integrated Sustainable Urban Transport | | Baseline 1: No strategic integrated urban transport plan in Punjab  Baseline 2: No Provincial policy for integrated Sustainable Urban Transport is available | **Target 1:** 1 strategic plan for holistically planned integrated urban transport  Target 2: Provincial policy for integrated Sustainable Urban Transport formulated, approved and implemented. | Specific plans, policies, evaluation | Continued good support from Govt. of Punjab and all stakeholders |
| **Output- 2** Operational sustainable urban transport system in Sindh Province | **Sub- Output 2.1**: Feasibility plans and approved financing with “integrated BRT plans” for cities in Sindh Province  **Indicator 1:** Number of completed feasibility plans prepared for BRT in Sindh  **Indicator 2:**  Number of public private financing secured based on the selected feasibility study (ECF/IPDF) | | **Baseline 1:** No complete feasibility plan on BRT is available in Sindh  **Baseline 2:** No public private financing secured base on the selected feasibility study | **Target 1:**1 bankable integrated BRT feasibility with implementation plan  **Target 2:** 02 financial institutions with commitment to finance BRT systems | Specific studies & evaluation related to the feasibility studies | Firm support from Government of Sindh and all related stakeholders. | Regular: $661,430 Other (GEF): $1,056,570 |
| **Sub- Output 2.2:** Strengthened institutional framework that enables holistic urban transport development.  **Indicator 1:** Number of institutional framework developed to facilitate holistic urban transport planning in Sindh | | **Baseline 1:** Multiple entities in an un-coordinated manner are involved in SUT in Sindh | **Target 1:** New policy framework proposing & stream-lining the reporting lines, responsibilities and accountability for each relevant agencies (Sindh Govt, and other institutions) | Specific tools, plans, policies/planning and management exercise based on advanced research, evaluation, field observations | Harmony amongst all stakeholders and Sindh Government willingness and strong commitment. |
| **Sub-Output 2.3**: A strategic plan for the development of sustainable urban transport in Sindh Province  **Indicator 1:** Number of strategic integrated urban transport plans | | **Baseline 1:** No strategic integrated urban transport plans are available in Sindh | **Target 1:** 1 strategic plan for holistically planned integrated urban transport | Specific plans, policies, evaluation | Continued good support from Govt. of Sindh and all stakeholders |
| **Sub- Output 2.4**: Approved and enforced Sindh provincial policy that enables development and operation of sustainable urban transport systems  **Indicator 1**: Number of provincial policies for developing sustainable urban transport for Sindh province | | **Baseline 1:** Lack of comprehensive urban transport policy framework  in Sindh | **Target 1:** 1 approved Sindh provincial policy on sustainable urban transport with associated implementing rules and regulation (IRRs) | Sindh provincial policy on SUT, IRRs, evaluation, field observation, mentoring events | Full stakeholder support along with the provincial government’s willingness |
| Sub-Output 2.5: An operational demonstration BRT system  Indicator 1: Number of institutions with enhanced capacity to operate, maintain, and manage a BRT system  Indicator 2: Cumulative GHG reductions from the BRT demos in 02 cities of Sindh- ktonnes CO2   1. Indicator 3: Cumulative energy savings generated by BRT pilot demonstration 2. Indicator 4: % increase in public transit ridership 3. Indicator 5: Methodology and M&E plan designed for the measurement of the specific energy and emission parameters | | Baseline 1: No fully operational demo BRT system  Baseline 2:No decline in GHG emissions due to lack of institutional coordination within the Govt. of Sindh (0 ktonnes CO2)  Baseline 3: No energy saving calculations available  Baseline 4: No calculations of public transit ridership  Baseline 5: No methodology and M&E plan available for the measurement of specific energy and emission parameters | Target 1: One operational BRT system with no. of institutions having enhanced capacity to operate, maintain, and manage a BRT system  Target 2: 10,140 tonnes of CO2 reduced by the BRT demonstration   1. Target 3: 490 toe of energy saved from BRT demonstration   **Target 4:** 4% increase in public transit ridership  **Target 5:** M&E plan (including methodology) development for calculating energy & emission savings | Surveys, specific studies/SOPs/NEQs, evaluation, field observations, interviews, spot checks | Activities planned are fully supported and implemented by the Government of Sindh and all stakeholders |
| **Output 3:** Improved energy efficiency in truck freight transport | **Sub- Output 3.1:** Approved and enforced policies on energy efficiency in truck freight transport  **Indicator** 1: Number of background studies completed to support Trucking Policy implementation  **Indicator 2**: Number of implementing rules and regulations (IRRs) and implementing actions formulated and recommended for approval  **Indicator 3:**Number of IRRs approved and enforced | | **Baseline 1:** No background studies are available to support Trucking Policy implementation that improves energy efficiency of truck freight transport  **Baseline 2:** No implementing rules and regulations (IRRs) & implementing actions are available in support of Trucking Policy 2008 | **Target 1:** 10 background studies completed on supporting implementation of Trucking Policy  **Target 2:** 5 implementing rules and regulations formulated  **Target 3:** 5 IRRs approved and enforced | Documentation of the background studies/energy efficiency policies/ strategy along with the IRRs | Firm support from Government and all related stakeholders. | Regular: $577,500 Other (GEF): $922,500 |
| **Sub-Output 3.2:** Completed pilots to implement strategy to modernize trucking fleet  **Indicator 1:** Number of trucks involved with pilots to demonstrate energy efficiency objectives of Trucking Policy  **Indicator 2:** Cumulative GHG reductions from a pilot scheme to modernize the trucking fleet- ktonnes CO2  **Indicator 3:** Cumulative energy savings generated from truck modernization pilots | | **Baseline 1:**No trucks involved as pilot for energy efficiency/truck modernization  **Baseline 2:** No emission calculation is available along the pilot trucking scheme  **Baseline 3:** No energy saving calculations available from the pilot of truck modernization | **Target 1:** M&E plan (including methodology) development for calculating energy & emission savings based on 50 trucks involved in pilot  **Target 2:** 5 ktonnes CO2 (direct reduction from truck modernization programme)  **Target 3:** 150 toe of energy saved from truck modernization pilot | Documentation on plans and implementation of truck modernization pilot. | Full stakeholder support including existing truck operator, their associations and truck body assemblers. |
|  | **Sub-Output 3.3:** Established public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the modernization of the trucking fleet.  **Indicator 1:** Number of public-private partnerships (PPPs) for truck modernization  **Indicator 2:** Number of trucks planned for involvement in replication of pilots | | **Baseline 1:** No PPPs are available to sustain the modernization of the trucking fleet  **Baseline 2:** No trucks involvement in replication of pilots | **Target 1:** 3 public-private partnerships (PPPs) established  **Target 2:** 2000 trucks involved in plans for replication of truck modernization | Documentation of real costs and benefits of truck modernization  Documentation of the management and progress of financing plans for truck modernization | Private-public partnerships (PPPs) support from Government and all related stakeholders. |
| **Output 4:** Increased public awareness and institutional capacity on sustainable transport concepts | **Sub-Output 4.1:** Completed awareness raising campaigns on sustainable transport concepts  **Indicator 1:** Extent to which completed awareness raising campaigns have been effective  **Indicator 2:** Extent to which cities benefiting from awareness raising campaigns | | **Baseline 1:** No focused awareness campaigns are available in Pakistan to promote SUT concepts | **Target 1:**  5 awareness raising campaigns conducted on concept of sustainability in transport sector, BRT as best model for SUT in Punjab, Sindh and Rawalpindi/Islamabad  **Target 2:**  3 cities where awareness raising campaigns have been conducted including; Karachi, Lahore and Rawalpindi/Islamabad | Field observation, interviews and related to urban transport awareness raising campaigns, media coverage, event reports/photographic coverage and implementation evaluations | Reliable information obtained & continued support from all stakeholders/Project partners for implementation | Regular: $617,771 Other (GEF): $986,829 |
| **Sub-Output 4.2:** Completed training program on strategic urban land use and transportation planning conducted at various training, academic and vocational institutes in Pakistan  **Indicator 1:**Number of completed training courses on strategic urban land use and sustainable urban transport planning (SUTP)  **Indicator 2:**Extent to which cities and provincial planners and students effectively trained on land use planning (LUP) and SUTP  **Indicator 3:**Number of educational institutes where LUP and SUTP courses are offered | | **Baseline**: No capacities exist in Pakistan regarding urban land use and sustainable urban transport planning | **Target 1:**  8 training courses related to strategic urban land use and sustainable urban transport area (3 courses in 2014; 3 courses in 2015; 2 courses in 2016)  **Target 2:**  30 city and provincial planners and students trained (10 city and provincial planners in 2014; 10 city and provincial planners in 2015; and 10 city and provincial planners in 2016)  **Target 3:**  4 educational institutes where LUP and SUTP courses offered | Training reports/material, training evaluation, spot check/interviews with trainees, photographic coverage | Relevant stakeholders/Project partners and target groups interested in participating and cooperating in the design, development and implementation of trainings |
| **Sub- Output 4.3**: Sharing experiences on integrated BRT development and implementation of the Trucking Policy  **Indicator 1:**Extent to which the completed workshops on integrated BRT development have been effective  **Indicator 2:**Extent to which the completed workshops on the implementation of the Trucking Policy have been effective | | **Baseline:** No experiences exist in Pakistan regarding SUT and trucking that could be shared for replication | **Target 1:**  8 workshops on integrated BRT development (conducted by CIUs & reporting/dissemination by IUCN)  **Target 2:**  8 workshops on Trucking Policy implementation completed (conducted by CIU-Trucking & reporting/dissemination by IUCN) | Specific trainings /workshops material and reports, field observations, evaluation, minutes of the workshops conducted, photographic evidence and media coverage | Continued good support from relevant stakeholders and target groups interested in participating and cooperating in the design, development and implementation of workshops/experiences sharing. |  |
|  | Project Management, Monitoring & Evaluation | | | | | | $462,000  $738,000 |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

* GEF Concept and/or Proposal, Project Document signed Version
* Annual Progress Report 2013
* Annual Progress Report 2014
* Annual Progress Report 2015
* Annual Progress Report 2016
* PIRs submitted to GEF
* Annual Work Plans 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016
* Minutes of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd , 4th, 5th, and 6th Project Board Meetings
* Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed bythe evaluation team and submitted with the TE inception report and as an annex to the TE report.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the AF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Was/Is the project a good idea given the situation needing improvement? | Strengthened Institutional capacities to develop policies and plans for establishing sustainable urban transport system in the country. | * Progress Reports * Mid-Term Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports |
|  | * Does it deal with target group priorities? Why or why not? | Background studies completed to support BRT operations in Lahore, Rawalpindi/Islamabad and Karachi. | * Annual Reports * Mid-Term Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Have the planned purpose and component objectives, outputs and activities been achieved? | * Sustainable transport policies developed for materialising the concept of sustainable urban/freight transport. * Research centres established to carry on research on transport and climate change beyond the project life. * Capacity development programmes developed and implemented | * Annual Reports * Mid-Term Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Were inputs (resources and time) used in the best possible way to achieve outcomes? | Human and technical capacities developed of the officials from various transport related institutions. | * Annual Reports * Mid-Term Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed towards its longer-term goals? Why or why not? What unanticipated positive or negative consequences did the project have? Why did they arise? | Improved living conditions through improvement in environmental quality and transport system in target cities of the country. | * Annual Mid-Term * Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed towards risks and environmental issues (or other long-term goals)? | Project built capacities of the people and developed policies to reduce negative impacts of transport in targeted cities in particular and in the country in general. | * Annual Reports * Mid-Term Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports | |
|  | * What are the remaining risks to project sustainability? | Lack of political will to keep continue working on establishing/maintaining the sustainable transport system in the country. |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Will there be continued positive impacts as a result of the project once it has finished? | Continued research work of the established centres and the BRT systems in the selected cities. | * Annual Reports * Mid-Term Evaluation Report | * Individual Interviews * Desk Reviews * Reports | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA &EA Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 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 | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is completeand fair in its assessment of strengths andweaknesses so that decisions or actions takenare well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluationfindings along with information on theirlimitations and have this accessible to allaffected by the evaluation with expressedlegal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentialityof individual informants. Theyshould provide maximum notice, minimizedemands on time, and respect people’sright not to engage. Evaluators must respectpeople’s right to provide information inconfidence, and must ensure that sensitiveinformation cannot be traced to its source.Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals,and must balance an evaluation ofmanagement functions with this generalprinciple.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoingwhile conducting evaluations. Such casesmust be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluator shouldconsult with other relevant oversight entitieswhen there is any doubt about if and howissues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners andcustoms and act with integrity and honestyin their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration ofHuman Rights, evaluators must be sensitiveto and address issues of discriminationand gender equality. They should avoidoffending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come incontact in the course of the evaluation.Knowing that evaluation might negativelyaffect the interests of some stakeholders,evaluators should conduct the evaluationand communicate its purpose and results ina way that clearly respects the stakeholders’dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance andtheir product(s). They are responsible forthe clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations,findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting proceduresand be prudent in using the resources of theevaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF project * UNDP and GEFproject ID#s * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * 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 Manual[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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) * 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 * 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:*Terminal AF Tracking Tool, if applicable |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in 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 H: TE Report audit trail

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

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of the project titled “**Pakistan Sustainable Transport (PAKSTRAN) project (Project ID: 00072773; PIMS No. 3953).*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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See Annex D for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)