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# Introduction

This document presents an inception report of the United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) “Sustainable Road and Transport Management” Project Atlas ID: SAU10/79238 (herein referred to as the “Project”).

# Background and Context

The National Transport Strategy (NTS) for 2030 was developed to help fulfil Kingdom Vision 2030 by identifying the challenges faced by government entities and establishing targets and initiatives to overcome those challenges and the Project is participating in achieving the NTS, set targets and Kingdom Vision 2030 strategic objectives which will lead to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals especially SDG (9) ‘‘Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure’’ and SDG (13) ‘‘Climate Action’’ where these two goals are critical drivers of economic growth and development of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) road network.

The Ministry of Transport (MOT) as policy leading agency for the transport sector is responsible for reporting and periodical review of the NTS, which has been developed with the assistance of UN agencies, mainly UNDP and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Within this national strategy MOT is aiming at developing sustainable transport systems and improving road safety. Therefore, the Project addresses two activity fields:

1. Strengthening governance through NTS reporting and review
2. Capacity building for road and transport safety

Both are prominent activities that emanate from NTS and assistance and advice by experts is considered important for successfully achieving these tasks. Project activities give special focus on:

* Developing an activity plan for reducing carbon emissions of the transport sector,
* Improving road safety by applying intelligent transport systems, and
* Making NTS a sustainable sector strategy though comprehensive monitoring and review.

The project document was agreed and signed by UNDP and MOT on 22nd October 2011 and 23rd October 2011, respectively. The total allocated budget for the project was USD $7,046,746 fully funded by the government of KSA.

In November 2013, a “Substantive Project and Budget Revision” was set out to initial project personnel to render support to the extent of tasks for NTS implementation and for comprehensive planning procedures as those emanate from the Council of Ministers decrees and the instructions of the Minister. Tasks of the project includes capacity building and application of international best practices for monitoring and reporting of the National Transportation Strategy and for establishing planning procedures and transport statistics system. Hence the budget of the Project is increased by USD $2,776,725 to reach a total allocated budget of USD $9,823,471, fully funded by the government of KSA.

In 2017, a second “Substantive Project and Budget Revision” was set out, for two years until 31st December 2018, to provide support to new activities for both National Transformation Programme 2020 and National Transportation Strategy implementation as per the Council of Ministers decrees. The revision intended to substantively address newly embraced Government's objectives of road safety and better road performance. Such orientation will be met through recruitment of short-term experts to render technical assistance to Ministry of Road in delivering aspects that were added to its conventional mandate. Parallel to this revision, the project maintained its advisory services conceived under the original project document signed on 22 October 2011. The budget for this revision was set to be USD $4,221,409, fully funded by the government of KSA.

In January 2019, a third “Substantive Project and Budget Revision” was set out, for two years until 31st December 2020, to provide support to new initiatives implemented by MOT under National Transformation Program 2020 and Kingdom 2030. The revision intended to substantively address newly embraced Government's objectives of improve efficiency of Transportation Infrastructure. The budget of the Project has increased by USD $1,275,000, fully funded by the government of KSA.

The tasks related to both the Vision 2030 and the NTS (2030) initiatives require a high level of coordination among MOT departments and with other government agencies and demand additional specialized knowledge to support the Strategic Planning Department and other concerned MOT entities.

Due to the new context of the Vision 2030 and the current need for MOT to focus on the implementation of the new initiatives such as coordination with Ministry of Municipal Rural Affairs (MOMRA), the duration of the Project was extended beyond the original to 2022. In December 2020, another “Substantive Project and Budget Revision” was set out to provide support to new initiatives implemented by MOT based on the Council of Ministers Decree No. 766, dated July 21, 2020 and the Agreement between MOT & MOMRA dated April 7, 2019 as part of the NTS and Kingdom Vision 2030. This revision intends to substantive address newly embraced Government's objectives of improve efficiency of Transportation Infrastructure. In order to achieve this objective, the Project is going to be completed by 31 December 2022 with an additional increase in budget of an amount of USD $2,100,000.

# Evaluation Objective, Purpose and Scope

The Project has been ongoing since 2011 and has, thus far, never been evaluated. Drastic changes have been taking place in the country and the project has had to adapt to the changes over recent years, this included changes in Ministers, Deputy Ministers and Project staff, resulting in changing Project directions. In order to ensure the Project has delivered its intended objectives and to provide recommendations for the way forward, it was imperative to conduct a final evaluation. This evaluation will benefit the Ministry of Transport in their planning for future years to meet Saudi Vision 2030 and highlight the impacts this project has had on the transport sector over the past few years.

This evaluation will cover all components of the Project, from 2012 till 2020, summarized as follows.

## From 2012 to 2016

Component 1: Strengthening Governance and Public Administration through NTS Reporting and Review

* 1. NTS reporting and review mechanism
	2. NTS status reports
	3. NTS five-year review
	4. NTS task force support
		1. Plan for reducing carbon emissions
		2. Comprehensive transport planning
		3. Transport data and statistics program

Component 2: Capacity Building for Road and Transport Safety

* 1. Development of Intelligent Transport System applications for improving road safety on selected highway sections
	2. Enhancing MOT planning and administrative capacities for road safety management and for planning and administration ITS technologies

## From 2017 to 2018

* Output 1: Develop National Safety Programme of Land Transport
	1. Demand and Supply Traffic Management Studies
	2. Support the development of the Transport Data and Statistics System
	3. Capacity Building of the MOT Staff
* Output 2: Develop Road Performance Maintenance Contracts. Outsourcing, Contracting and

 Procurement Strategies

2.1 Review Bids and Tender Documents

2.2 Identify and Implements actions to Improve Efficiencies of the Procurement Process

2.3 Capacity Building of the MOT Staff involved in the Procurement Process

Integrated Coordination between MOT and MOMRA for Developing Transport Network

* Output 3: Advisory Services to MOT

3.1 Maintain advisory services to MOT in implementation of the NTP

3.1.1 Support for the development of a Transport Data, Statistics and Analysis unit and system at MOT

3.1.2 Support for the development of a General Transport Master Plan and Planning System at MOT

3.1.3 Support for road lifecycle cost optimization initiative

3.2 Consultancy Services provided to review of policies, regulations and guidelines

3.3 Support for adoption of policies, regulations and guidelines

## From 2019 to 2020

* Output 1: Scientific Models for Expansion the Roads Network Developed
	1. Strategic Planning Evaluation Activities
	2. Defining Road Works and Project Alternatives
	3. Performing Budget Constraints Optimization
	4. Delivering Sustainable Road Network Expansion Scientific Models
* Output 2: Crisis and Emergency Road Maintenance Plan & Strategy

2.1 Crisis/Emergency planning and management plan and support materials awareness and training programme

2.2 Risk Registers and a system to manage them

2.3 Design and establishment of MOT’s Crisis/Emergency management and response center

* Output 3: Advisory Services to MOT

3.1 Road Maintenance Technical Advisory Services

3.2 Support for the development of a Transport Data, Statistics and Analysis unit and system at MOT

3.2.1 Roads Implementation Technical Advisory Services Support for the development of a General Transport Master Plan and

3.3 Strategic Planning Advisory Services

3.3.1. Advertising Advisory Services

In addition, the evaluation[[2]](#footnote-2) will provide technical feedback for the project design of the integrated coordination between MOT and MOMRA for the three below expected outputs between 2021 and 2022:

* Output1: Transit Roads Outside Major Cities
* Output 2: Integrated Coordination between MOT and MOMRA for Developing Transport

 Network

* Output 3: Advisory Services to MOT

The evaluator shall consider the Saudi Vision 2030 objective’s and other MOT Initiatives in providing technical feedback based on the proposed recommendations which can improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP Goals: SDG (9) and SDG (13).

# Evaluability Analysis

The below six comments illustrate the check list for the evaluability analysis of the Project and confirm the initiation of the evaluation.

1. Even with the absence of a clearly defined theory of change[[3]](#footnote-3) (TOC) format in the Project Document (PD) , all five components (inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact) of the TOC are defined in the PD and all substantive and budget revisions.
2. All goals, outcome statements, outputs, inputs and activities are clearly defined in the PD and budget revisions related to the Project. Additionally, all stated indicators are specific, measurable, assignable, relevant and time-bound.
3. There is sufficient data to conduct the evaluation including: baseline data, data collected against a set of targets, annual progress reports, and other related technical and governmental reports and publications.
4. The Project has been ongoing since 2011 and has never been evaluated. Moreover, the purpose and scope of the evaluation are clearly in the PD. In this essence, based on the project design, substantive revisions, data availability, and resources availability, realistic evaluation questions are developed and illustrated in the Evaluation Matrix section.
5. The Ministry of Transport is the main and primary stakeholder implementing this Project; albeit the collaboration with other project stakeholders is crucial to ensure an effective and efficient implementation. Despite, the COVID-19 restrictions and regulations imposed in KSA, the evaluation can be performed as designed. Furthermore, the political, social and economic factors allow for effective implementation and use of the evaluation as envisaged.
6. The UNDP CO has allocated sufficient resources and will provide adequate support to conduct the evaluation as designed.

# Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The methodology of work will consist of desk review of relevant project documentation and direct consultations with the project management, staff and other key local stakeholders during five days’ site visit to Riyadh in October 2021. The overall duration of the assignment is expected to be 21 working days including 5 days’ site visit as described in the next section.

The Evaluation will use a combination of approaches to assess the achievements of the Project from several perspectives and a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. Desk reviews, face‐to‐face meetings, and follow up with key stakeholders will be applied as necessary. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluator will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The evaluation will be conducted in three phases as follows:

## Phase 1: Preparatory Phase

The first step in the evaluation is a desk review of the most important documents covering project design and implementation progress that provided the basic information regarding the activities carried out to attain the desired outcomes and outputs and the actual achievements. The list of documents reviewed is provided in this report. The review is followed by preparation of questions and discussion points aiming at gathering information from chosen stakeholders and factual information linked to the performance indicators in the evaluation matrix.

## Phase 2: Evaluation Matrix

An evaluation matrix is constructed based on the evaluation scope presented in the TOR. The matrix is structured along the five OECD-DAC evaluation criteria[[4]](#footnote-4) for Terminal Evaluations: (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency (d) impact; and (e) sustainability. The matrix will provide overall direction for the evaluation and will be used as a basis for interviewing stakeholders and further review of the project implementation reports.

Apart from the evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix includes evaluation questions on cross-cutting issues relating to the promotion of values from a human development perspective, namely questions on gender equality, women's empowerment, inclusion of vulnerable groups as well as other cross-cutting issues.

## Phase 3: Evaluation Field Mission

An evaluation field mission to KSA will be taken from 24th October 2021 to 28th October 2021. The preparation of the field mission will be conducted in close coordination with the UNDP Country Office (CO) in KSA. The CO will advise and agree the final timing of the mission and schedule of visits of the key informants. The purpose of the mission is to verify the information from the project implementation reports, collect missing data and learn about the opinions of key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners. All interviews will be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity under the support of the Project Management. The final evaluation report will not assign specific comments to individuals. To the extent possible, visit of relevant project sites to make directs observations of selected project will be also conducted during the evaluation mission.

The interviews will aim at soliciting responses to predetermined questions using semi-structured interviews based on the discussion points in a conversational form. The interviews will be designed to obtain in-depth information about the key informants’ impressions and experiences in the project implementation. Triangulation of results, i.e. comparing information from different sources, such as documentation and interviews, or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, will be used to corroborate or check the reliability of evidence. The mission will be concluded with a presentation of initial findings to the UNDP and the project team.

# Stakeholders

Key stakeholders should be identified and agreed with the UNDP CO to share their experiences and attitudes. Interviews will be participatory, to the greatest extent possible, allowing the interviewee to direct the content of the interview and identifying experiences and concepts which they considered to be the most important to the success or failure of interventions. By allowing interviewees to lead the interviews, the evaluator provides the opportunity to take ownership over the details. All interviews will be recorded and translated into English for analysis; when applicable and with the consent of the interview.

This evaluation is focused on collecting findings and providing findings to the following stakeholders, as illustrated in the below table. The list of stakeholders was refined and updated after discussion with the UNDP CO and taking into consideration the current COVID-19 restrictions and time constraints.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/R | Entity Name  | Entity Type | Required Time | Level of Interest |
| 1 | UNDP | UN agency | One Day | High |
| 2 | MOT/ Management | Government agency | ½ Day | High |
| 3 | MOMRA /Division related to MOT | Government agency | ½ Day | High |
| 4 | National Road Safety Center (NRSC) | Government agency | One Day | High |
| 5 | MOT/Quality Department (LABS) | Government agency | One Day | High |
| 6 | MOT/ Projects Management Division | Government agency |  ½ Day | High |
| 7 | Transit Roads (Trucks)/Consultant | Private Company | ½ Day/ Online | Low |
| 8 | Jeddah Port  | Government agency | ¼ Day | Low |
| 9 | Academic Institution (TBA[[5]](#footnote-5)) | Private Institution | ¼ Day /Online | Low |
| 10 | ITS Company  | Private Company | ½ Day /Online | Low  |

# Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Evaluation questions define the information that this evaluation will generate. Questions in the evaluation are grouped according to the five OECD-DAC evaluation criteria[[6]](#footnote-6): (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency (d) impact; and (e) sustainability identified in the evaluation matrix section.

Ratings will be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table will be included in the evaluation executive summary.

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

The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are provided in terminal evaluation are: (1) Monitoring and Evaluation, (2) Implementation and Execution, (3) Assessment of Outcomes, and (4) Sustainability.

**Monitoring and Evaluation Ratings**

Quality of project M&E are assessed in terms of design and implementation on a six-point scale:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations |
| Satisfactory (S)  | There were no or minor short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | There were some short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation more or less meets expectations |
| page16image5840800Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation somewhat lower than expected |
| page16image1687680Unsatisfactory (U)  | page16image3775264There were major short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected |
| page16image3721392Highly Unsatisfactory (U)  | page16image1664176There were severe short comings in M&E design/ implementation |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design / implementation |

**Implementation and Execution Ratings**

Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | There were no short comings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations |
| Satisfactory (S)  | There were no or minor short comings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | There were some short comings and quality of implementation / execution more or less meets expectations |
| page16image5840800Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution somewhat lower than expected |
| page16image1687680Unsatisfactory (U)  | page16image3775264There were major short comings and quality of implementation / execution substantially lower than expected |
| page16image3721392Highly Unsatisfactory (U)  | page16image1664176There were severe short comings in quality of implementation / execution |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution |

**Assessment of Outcome Ratings**

The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance of the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings |
| Satisfactory (S)  | Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings  |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings |
| page16image5840800Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings |
| page16image1687680Unsatisfactory (U)  | page16image3775264Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings |
| page16image3721392Highly Unsatisfactory (U)  | page16image1664176Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements |

**Sustainability Ratings**

The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| page16image1628400Likely (L) | There is little or no risks to sustainability |
| Moderately Likely (ML) | There are moderate risks to sustainability |
| page16image3697056Moderately Unlikely (MU) | There are significant risks to sustainability  |
| Unlikely (U) | There are severe risks to sustainability  |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | page16image3684784Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Relevance and Project Formulation** |
| To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?To what extent does the project contribute to the country programme outcome especially in addressing the transport sector in Saudi Arabia?  | Number of development and sectoral plans/strategies relevant for the projectLevel of alignment between the project objectives/outcomes and national development and sectoral strategies  | UNDP Progamme/Project DocumentsNTP/NTS | Desk Review of secondary dataInterviews with UNCTInterviews with MOT |
| Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame? Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered in the project design? To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the project assumptions and risks well identified in the Project Document?  | Level of participation of key and tangential stakeholders in the project design and implementation Level of stakeholder analysis at the project design stage | Project DocumentsUNDP StaffMOT | Interview with UNDP StaffInterviews with MOT |
| Are the resources allocated sufficient to achieve the objectives of the project? To what extent has the project enhanced knowledge on transportation behaviour change, particularly on sustainable transportationTo what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, environmental, institutional, etc., changes in the country? | Level of Knowledge acquired by beneficiaries regarding sustainable transportation Level of alignment with the gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach Level of alignment with the priorities mentioned in the NTP and NTS Level of alignment with the priorities mentioned in UNDP Country Programme Document  | Government partners involved in specific results/thematic areas Concerned civil society partners National policies and strategies Number of development and sectoral plans/strategies relevant for the projectAnnual Work Plans Programmes/projects/ thematic areas evaluation reportsGovernment’s national planning documentsInterviews with beneficiaries | Desk ReviewInterviews with UNCTInterviews with MOTInterviews with concerned governmental agenciesInterview with civil societies in the concerned sector Related Constitutional bodies such as Human Rights, Women Rights, etc.  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management** |
| Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of the new NTS/NTP and/or of other review procedures? Did the changes materially change the expected project outcomes? Were there adequate provisions in the project design for consultation with stakeholder? To what extent were effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant partners? To what extent were lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project implementation? Whether feedback from M&E activities was used for adaptive management? | Level of solution of implementation issues solved by PMU/UNDPQuality and level of use of implementation monitoring tools | Minutes of the Project Board meetingsAnnual Work Plans Annual Progress ReportsGovernment partners UNDP staff  | Interviews with UNDP staff Interviews with government partners Desk review of secondary data  |
| Was the M&E plan well-conceived at the design phase and sufficient to track progress toward achieving objectives? Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation? Were the monitoring indicators from the project document effective for measuring progress and performance? Was the logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool? What has been the level of compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports? What was the extent to which follow-up actions, and/ or adaptive management, were taken in response to monitoring reports? | M&E Plan design and implementation Quality and level of use of implementation monitoring tools Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and implemented Level of financial controls established and used to provide feedback on implementation   | Programme documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Evaluation reports Government partners UNDP staff  | Interviews with UNDP staff Interviews with government partners Desk review of secondary data |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Effectiveness** |
| To what extent were the project outputs achieved especially in achieving sustainable transport?What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?  | Target indicators in the project results framework Level of coherence between the project design and implementation approaches Level of coherence between activities and outputs/outcomes Level of management of assumptions and risks  | Project/programme reports Data reported in project annual UNDP staff Government partnersBeneficiaries  | Interviews with UNDP staff Interviews with government partners Desk review of project annual reports  |
| Who are the direct beneficiaries and how many of them were affected by the project? Who are the ultimate beneficiaries and to what extent have they been reached by the project? To what extent do the poor, indigenous groups, women, and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefit? To what extent women were involved in the implementation of the actions indirectly or directly. | Level of outreach of the project to the ultimate beneficiaries Level of inclusion of marginal groups of beneficiaries Cooperation with partners on project implementation  | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners UNDP staffBeneficiaries | Desk ReviewInterviews with UNCTInterviews with MOTInterviews with concerned governmental agenciesInterview with civil societies in the concerned sector Related Constitutional bodies such as Human Rights, Women Rights, etc. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Efficiency** |
| To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management? | Level of adherence to the original timeframe and budgetQuality of annual workplans versus the project versus the project logframeLevel of solution of implementation issues solved by UNDPComparison of planned versus. actual funds leveragedTimeliness and adequacy of reporting provided Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures Quality and level of use of implementation monitoring tools  | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners UNDP staff | Desk ReviewInterviews with UNCTInterviews with MOTInterviews with concerned governmental agencies |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Impact** |
| What are the major impacts this project has made on the project outcomes?To what extent has this project affected positive change?Have the relevant government agencies undertaken measures to support the adoption of the project’s results and their inclusion as national priorities?Have senior and influential government officials endorsed the project’s innovative approaches and champion the development of a more enabling policies, mechanisms and strategies for wider adoption? | Level of coherence between the project outcomes and intended impactsNature of conditions for conversion of outcomes into impactsQuality and level of collaboration between the stakeholder institutions | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners UNDP staff | Desk ReviewInterviews with UNCTInterviews with MOTInterviews with concerned governmental agencies |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Sustainability** |
| Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?Are there any social, economic, environmental or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?Do the institutional and legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?To what extent are institutional and human resource capacities strengthened to provide effective technical support to national partners and stakeholders for energy efficiency actions?  | Level and quality of identification of sustainability issues Nature and quality of corrective measures by the project management to address sustainability issues | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners  |  |
| What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained? To what extent the project was effective to enhance integration of sustainable transport in public and private sector actions?To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?  | Level of stakeholder awareness and ownership of the project results | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners  | Interviews with government representativesInterviews with other stakeholders’ representativesDesk review |
| To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability? | Quality and level of self-sufficiency of institutional frameworks for continuation of activities after project completionAvailability of counterpart/stakeholder funding for the project outcomes | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports UNDP staff | Desk reviewInterviews with UNCT |

|  |
| --- |
| **SAMPLE QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE PROMOTION OF UN VALUE FROM A HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE**  |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Human Rights** |
| To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country? To what extent does the project ensure that no one is left behind in regards to project benefits? | Level and quality of monitoring of social inclusion related issues | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners UNDP Staff | Interviews with UNCTInterviews with government representativesInterviews with other stakeholders’ representativesDesk review |
| **Gender Equality** |
| To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any positive or negative unintended effects? | Level and quality of monitoring of gender related issues  | Projects documents Annual Work Plans Annual Progress Reports Government partners UNDP Staff | Interviews with UNCTInterviews with government representativesInterviews with other stakeholders’ representativesDesk review  |

# Workplan

The below workplan illustrates the timeline for the evaluation over a period three months.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **ESTIMATED # OF WORKING DAYS** | **DATE OF COMPLETION** | **PLACE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| **Phase One: Desk review and inception report** |
| Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed) | - | At the time of the Mission Started 12 Oct 2021 | UNDP or remote  | Evaluation manager and commissioner |
| Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team | - | At the time of contract signing  29 Sep 2021 | Via email | Evaluation manager and commissioner |
| Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed | 3 days | Within two weeks of contract signing 12 Oct 2021 | Home- based | Evaluation Consultant |
| Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum) | - | By 12 Oct 2021 |  | Evaluation Consultant |
| Comments and approval of inception report | - |  By 14 Oct 2021 | UNDP | Evaluation manager |
| **Phase Two: Data-collection mission** |
| Consultations and field visits, semi-structured interviews | 5 |  24-28 Oct 2021 | In countryWith field visits | UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, etc. |
| Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders |  | 28 Oct 2021 | In country | Evaluation Consultant |
| **Phase Three: Evaluation report writing** |
| Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages) and Draft Report submission  | 5  | Within Two weeks of the completion of the field mission14 Nov 2021 | Home- based | Evaluation Consultant |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report  | - |  By 21 Nov 2021 | UNDP | Evaluation manager and evaluation reference group |
| Finalization and submission of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office | 2  | By 26 Nov 2021 | Home- based | Evaluation Consultant |
| Providing Technical Support for the draft Project Document | 4 | Within one week of final evaluation report acceptance5 Dec 2021 | Home- based | Evaluation Consultant |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder Comments on Project Document | - | Within one week from draft PD submission12 Dec 2021 |  | UNDP and National Partner |
| Finalization of PD Review  | 2 | Within 5 days from receiving comments 16 Dec 2021 |  | Evaluation Consultant |
| **Estimated total days for the evaluation** | **21** |  |  |  |

# Resource Requirements

In addition to the roles and responsibilities of the evaluator, support from UNDP and commissioning partners is required. This will include assistance in identifying appropriate sources of information within UNDP.  Assistance would be requested to communicate with implementing partners who are involved in the program. To add additional contextual value to evaluation findings, the assistance of UNDP to coordinate and provide transportation and security to numerous field visits and interviews for the evaluator would be highly beneficial.

The evaluator also requests support from UNDP in the review phases of instrument design and analysis. Their in-depth knowledge and experience in programme design and implementation. In addition to relations with related ministries will provide valuable contextual insight to ensure the evaluation addresses niche areas of interest.

# List of Documents Consulted

1. Project Document: Sustainable Road and Transport Management, UNDP, October 2011.
2. Substantive Project and Budget Revision, MOT/UNDP, November 2013.
3. Substantive Project and Budget Revision, MOT/UNDP, May 2017.
4. Substantive Project and Budget Revision, MOT/UNDP, January 2019.
5. Substantive Project and Budget Revision, MOT/UNDP, December 2020.
6. Annual Project Progress Report: 01 January 2012 - 31 December 2012.
7. Annual Project Progress Report: 01 January 2012- 31 December 2013.
8. Annual Project Progress Report: 01 January 2014 - 31 December 2014.
9. Annual Project Progress Report: 01 January 2015 - 31 December 2015.
10. Annual Project Progress Report: 01 January 2016 - 31 December 2016.
11. Final Project Review Report or Annual Project Progress Report, 2017.
12. Summary Report of Activities undertaken by UNDP Expert, May 2017 to End of 2018.
13. Annual Progress Report 2019.
14. Annual Progress Report 2020.
15. Terms of Reference, Final Evaluation for Sustainable Road and Transport Management, June 2021
16. Saudi Vision 2030.
17. National Transformation Program, Website. Last access: 3rd October 2021. <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa/v2030/vrps/ntp/>
18. National Transformation Program Delivery Plan 2021-2025.
19. National Transportation Strategy, 2011.
20. National Transportation and Logistics Strategy. Last access:3rd October 2021. <https://www.ntls.website/en/road-transport-sector>
21. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP, 2021.
22. Evaluation Quality Assessment- Section 6, Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP, 2021.
23. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, OECD, 2010
24. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations, United Nations Evaluation Group, 2020.

# Outline of Final Report

1. Title and opening pages
2. Project and evaluation information details
3. Table of contents.
4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.
5. Executive summary.
6. Introduction
7. Description of the intervention
8. Evaluation scope and objectives.
* Evaluation scope.
* Evaluation objectives.
* Evaluation criteria.
* Evaluation questions
1. Evaluation approach and methods.
* Evaluation approach.
* Data sources
* Data-collection procedures and instruments
* Performance standards
* Stakeholder participation
* Ethical considerations
* Major limitations of the methodology
1. Data analysis.
2. Findings
3. Conclusions
4. Recommendations.
5. Lessons learned.
6. Report annexes.
* TOR for the evaluation.
* Additional methodology-related documentation.
* List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited.
* List of supporting documents reviewed.
* Project or programme results model or results framework.
* Summary tables of findings.
* Code of conductsigned by evaluator.
1. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. To be agreed with the UNDP CO and Evaluation Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. During the Design Phase of the Project (2011), the Theory of Change was not a requirement [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of human rights and gender dimensions and these dimensions need to be added into the evaluation criteria chosen (see page 77, table 10 of [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](http://unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616)). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Entity name to be advised (TBA) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of human rights and gender dimensions and these dimensions need to be added into the evaluation criteria chosen (see page 77, table 10 of [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](http://unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616)). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)