United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Saudi Arabia Country Office

## Final Evaluation of project: Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey DECEMBER 2021 General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information

Evaluator:	Valentin Kotzev
Atlas ID:	SAU10-110186
Evaluation time frame:	September 2021-December 2021
Date of Evaluation Report:	November 2021
Country:	Saudi Arabia
Executing Agency:	General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information

**Acknowledgments:** The evaluator would like to thank the UNDP Saudi Arabia Country Office and the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information for the support provided throughout the realization of this Final Evaluation.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION				
Project/outcome title	Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey			
Atlas ID	SAU10-110186			
Corporate outcome and output	Outcome: Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure Output: National Policies developed to promote economic diversification with increased employment of Nationals			
Country	Saudi Arabia			
Region	RBAS			
Date project document signed	14 May 2018			
Duciest datas	Start	Planned end		
Project dates	1 May 2018	31 December 2021		
Project budget	4,933,749			
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	3,418,614			
Funding source	Government			
Implementing party <sup>1</sup>	The General Authority for Survey & Geospatial Information			

# **Table of Contents**

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONSV
NUMBERING SYSTEM USED IN THE DOCUMENTVI
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY7
Overview of the Objective and Methodology7
Brief Project Description7
Main Findings
Conclusions
Recommendations10
Lessons Learned 12
REPORT CONTENT
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW
Purpose of the Evaluation13
Key Issues Addressed
Methodology of the Evaluation14
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT BEING EVALUATED15
Project Start, Expected Duration, and Funding16
Project Extension
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address       17         Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project       17         Expected Results       18         Main Stakeholders       18         EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES       18         Evaluation Questions       19
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address       17         Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project       17         Expected Results       18         Main Stakeholders       18         EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES       18         Evaluation Questions       19         EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS       19
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20FINDINGS21
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20FINDINGS21Project Design21
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20FINDINGS21Project Design21Project Implementation24
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20FINDINGS21Project Design21Project Implementation24Project Results27
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20FINDINGS21Project Design21Project Results24Project Results27Monitoring and Evaluation33
Problems that the Project Seeks to Address17Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project17Expected Results18Main Stakeholders18EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES18Evaluation Questions19EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS19Sources of Information19Data Collection Methods19DATA ANALYSIS20FINDINGS21Project Design21Project Results27Monitoring and Evaluation33Efficiency33

Coherence	
Sustainability	
CONCLUSIONS	
RECOMMENDATIONS	35
Recommendations Related to Project Design	35
Recommendations Related to Annual Planning and Execution	37
Recommendations Related to Project Reporting	38
Recommendations Related to Project Collaboration	39
Recommendations Related to Project Visibility	39
Recommendations Related to the GASGI New Mandate	39
Follow Lin	
	40
LESSONS LEARNED	40 40
LESSONS LEARNED	
LESSONS LEARNED ANNEX 1: TOR FOR THE EVALUATION ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS	
LESSONS LEARNED ANNEX 1: TOR FOR THE EVALUATION ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS ANNEX 3: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED	
LESSONS LEARNED ANNEX 1: TOR FOR THE EVALUATION ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS ANNEX 3: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	
LESSONS LEARNED ANNEX 1: TOR FOR THE EVALUATION ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS ANNEX 3: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ANNEX 5: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	40 40 41 55 66 
LESSONS LEARNED ANNEX 1: TOR FOR THE EVALUATION ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS ANNEX 3: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ANNEX 5: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ANNEX 6: PROJECT DOCUMENT	40 40 41 55 66 
LESSONS LEARNED ANNEX 1: TOR FOR THE EVALUATION ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX AND DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS ANNEX 3: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ANNEX 5: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ANNEX 6: PROJECT DOCUMENT ANNEX 7: SUBSTANTIVE PROJECT AND BUDGET REVISION	40 40 41 55 66 67 70 70 72 104

## **Tables**

Table 1. Annual Budget Allocations in USD.	. 25
Table 2. Summary of amounts per Output in PD and SBPR in USD	. 25
Table 3. Experts hired under the Project	. 26
Table 4. Level of Achievement of Output 1 based on Project Indicators.	. 27
Table 5. Level of Achievement of Output 2 based on Project Indicators.	. 28
Table 6. Level of Achievement of Output 3 based on Project Indicators.	. 30
Table 7. Level of Achievement of Output 4 based on Project Indicators.	. 31
Table 8. Level of Achievement of Output 5 based on Project Indicators.	. 32

# List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

APR	Annual Project Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EM	Evaluation Manager
GASGI	General Authority of Survey and Geospatial Information
GDG	General Department of Geodesy
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOSA	Government of Saudi Arabia
NGRF	National Geodetic Reference Frame
GSC	General Commission of Survey
IC	International Centre
IC-ENC	International Center for Electronic Navigational Charts
IGN	Institut Geographique National
IMO	International Maritime Organization
ISS	Implementation Support Services
KSA	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCGD/GIC	National Centre for Geospatial Data/Geospatial Information Center
NDGs	National Development Goals
NGDI	National Geospatial Data Infrastructure
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NPM	National Project Manager
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
РВ	Project Board
PD	Project Document
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
QA	Quality Assurance
RR	Resident Representative
RRF	Result and Resources Framework
SANRS	Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound

SPBR	Substantive Project and Budget Revision
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDP CO	United Nations Development Program Country Office
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
USD	United States Dollars

# Numbering System used in the Document

The numbering system in this document uses capital letters to label sections and numbers to label paragraphs. Thus

- F1, F2, and so on are used for Findings;
- C1, C2, and so on are used for Conclusions and
- R1, R2, and so on are used for Recommendations and
- L1, L2, and so on are used for Lessons Learned.

# **Executive summary**

## **Overview of the Objective and Methodology**

This Final Evaluation was undertaken between October and December 2021 and adhered to the UNDP guidelines and Terms of Reference (TOR) for this consultancy. The objective was (1) to assess the alignment of the project with the national development priorities, the UNDP country program and strategic plan, and the SDGs; (2) to analyze the project design, implementation strategy, approaches, challenges, and the extent to which these contributed to the achievement of project objectives; (3) to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments; and (4) to identify lessons that can help improve the design and implementation of current and future projects. The findings and recommendations will be used for the preparation of a new project under the strategic partnership that will support GASGI to deliver its intended task better and benefit from the lessons learned during the previous implementation.

The methodology included a detailed review of all relevant project documentation; a one-week incountry data collection mission involving interviews with GASGI management and technical staff, preparation and submission of a questionnaire to key stakeholders in the geospatial sector, a debriefing of the evaluation findings to UNDP and key stakeholders, and finally the preparation of the draft and final reports.

This evaluation adopted a qualitative approach in which the project performance was measured against intended outputs articulated in the Results and Resources Framework. It was found that the Annual Project Reports did not enable to measure progress against target indicators because a lot of information, processes, outputs and other accomplishments were not captured by the reports. To compensate for the gap, more emphasis was put on interviews and secondary data sources such as internal reports and technical documents. In total, interviews with 14 people representing GASGI key personnel involved in the project were conducted. All findings from these interviews were validated with documentation and follow-up interviews. The major achievements reported by interviewees were intended to be validated through a questionnaire that was distributed to key stakeholders. However, the survey results were not available at the time of the report.

## **Brief Project Description**

This project is a key element of the strategic partnership between the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information and the United Nations Development Program to strengthen and promote the survey and geospatial Information sector and create partnerships to market various survey products of the Authority. The project contributes to the key objective by supporting GCS/GASGI to carry out the activities under its mandate effectively and efficiently. The current phase seeks to improve the national capacities for production, collection, and processing of geospatial information and increase the effectiveness of its use in the Kingdom. This will be achieved through five planned Outputs:

**Output 1:** National Centre for Geospatial Data<sup>1</sup> (NCGD/GIC)established and operationalized.

**Output 2:** National capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The current name of the National Centre for Geospatial Data is Geospatial Information Center. Therefore, from now on in the text will be used "National Centre for Geospatial Data/Geospatial Information Center - NCGD/GIC" to keep consistency with the TOR for this evaluation.

**Output 3:** Advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy.

Output 4: Quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted.

Output 5: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS.

## **Main Findings**

#### **Project Design**

The project was aligned with the national development priorities and the priorities of the UNDP Country Program and Strategic Plan. The Outputs were designed to contribute to the desired result and the theory of change developed for the country program outcome.

The Result and Resources Framework (RRF) included specific and measurable targets for the end-ofproject. To less extent, this is valid for the SPBR, where some activities included many different subactivities, and additional indicators would have facilitated accountability and review. Both documents would have benefitted if specified who is responsible for each activity and in what specific timeframe.

The project did not foresee measures to address gender inequalities, disability, and social inclusion issues relevant to the results and activities.

The PD identified two main risks and a mitigation strategy - for the first one.

Stakeholders were not explicitly identified. The PD envisaged the establishment of a detailed focal point mechanism allowing "focal persons from all sectors to be trained on methods of updating geospatial data, improvement of data quality and enhancement of accuracy".

The project design ensured sustainability in developing the survey and geospatial sector in KSA as a national income source. That was done through alignment of RRF with the national priorities and government strategies, intensive capacity building, establishment of NCGD/GIC providing data and services to the entire geospatial sector, and the unification of performance standards.

The project management structure included PB of high-level representatives from GASGI and UNDP with the primary functions to review performance and make management decisions to ensure quality delivery of the project results. The PB members had project assurance responsibilities to support the PB in the project oversight and the National Project Manager to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf and within the constraints laid by the PB.

The Monitoring Plan was designed to cover progress tracking, monitoring and managing risk, learning and knowledge sharing, project quality assurance, project reviews and coarse corrections, and project reporting.

#### **Project Implementation**

This project was implemented under the NIM, where UNDP provided Implementation Support Services (ISS) for recruitment of international and national advisors while GCS/GASGI assumed implementation responsibility with the UNDP ISS.

The UNDP CO support was considered by GASGI as effective, efficient, and essential.

GASGI, as the Implementing Partner, performed its functions in accordance with the provisions of the PD. GASGI has the administrative and technical capacity to implement this project.

The National Project Manager (NPP), who is also the General Director Human Resources of GASGI, is the only member of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU). NPP is seen by UNDP CO to have employed

a professional, organized, and systematic approach to project execution. The M&E functions of NPM were mentioned in the PD but not implicitly allocated the Monitoring Plan to him.

At the time of this evaluation, the project budget was USD 4,933,749, with 69.3% of it spent. No information was available for the budget allocations and expenditures per each Output and year.

GASGI appreciated UNDP's capacity to recruit appropriate experts who provided a significant contribution to institutional capacity building. In total, 21 national and international experts had been hired on one-year contracts under the project. The international experts were on payroll by UNDP and were selected based on TOR prepared by GASGI. The national experts had contracts with the government and were paid via a request for direct payment.

#### **Project Results**

As detailed below, many of the targets set in the PD were met in terms of produced documents. However, fewer workshops were held, primarily because of the Covid restrictions and lockdowns. The degree of completion for the activities added with SBPR is less than planned. In that sense, the SPBR Work Plan may have been overly ambitious in terms of the expected targets.

Formal project outputs do not tell the whole story about the project progress. Many outputs were not generated directly from pre-specified activities, but by the highly qualified, technical experts hired with the support of UNDP.

Under Output 1, the NCGD/GIC was structured and implemented through an appropriate organizational design and governance structure. The planned new staff were recruited and attended training programs. To operationalize NCGD/GIC, a geospatial database based on a unified data model was designed and populated. In progress was work on a National Physical model and its components. GASGI started with good progress initiatives and activities to establish a National Geospatial Data Infrastructure (NGDI) related to this output. That included developing and updating the sector's key and guiding standards and controls to achieve integrated and adequate use of the geospatial information system among the stakeholders. Under this output, GASGI published Technical Summary for Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System, which describes the National Geodetic Reference Frame (NGRF), National Vertical Reference Frame, National Geoid Model. This information is essential for all positional and spatial data collection activities in the Kingdom.

Under Output 2, GASGI conveyed workshops for extensive training on hydrographic survey and oceanographic science. They were in the form of on-the-job training for the assigned GASGI Hydrographic Surveyors who rotate on/off the ship on a fourteen-day schedule. Most of the planned workshops on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sector institutions and on land survey, geodetic survey and topographic survey were not conducted due to the Covid restrictions and lockdowns. Where possible, GASGI replaced them with various online workshops and discussions. To provide a base for capacity building and awareness rising on the use of the NGRF, GASGI published Technical Summary for Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System (SANRS). A significant contribution to this Output was provided by the technical advisors hired with the support of UNDP

Under Output 3, designed and used to increase and promote the quality of geospatial products and services, GASGI Initiated studies to examine the development of a competitive geospatial market and economic value estimations for geospatial information and technologies in the Saudi economy. That was complemented by a study to analyze the GASGI's current position in order to develop the survey and geospatial sector in KSA as a national income source. At the time of this evaluation, GASGI was also in preparation of an action plan to rationalize spending and promote the sector by approving pricing for works, products, services, licenses, permits, and the fees of any work, product and service, that the Authority grants to concerned authorities. All mentioned activities were still in progress.

All activities under Output 4 were reported still in progress.

Under Output 5 supporting the GASGI's initiatives for promoting awareness about geospatial information, standards, and technologies, the Authority convened multiple workshops, messages, tweets, and TV interviews. GASGI recognizes that still more should be done according to the results and progress in the sector. Outside the planned activities, GASGI coordinated modified workshops to advance the awareness of and broader visibility of the Authority to the national stakeholders and general audience.

The activities in progress under Outputs 3, 4, and 5 were carried out with the active participation of the experts hired with the support of UNDP. Under Output 4, they provided input to the technical planning and operations for the respective GASGI departments. Under Output 5, the experts supported GASGI by providing ideas, content (written and presented), and logistic support to execute the tasks.

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

The monitoring plan was not fully implemented because of two negative factors: (1) lack of allocation of responsibility for M&E in the PD and (2) lack of clear definitions of target indicators and parameters after the SPBR. These factors did not allow the RRF to be used effectively to guide the project implementation and plan activities to achieve the targets.

## Conclusions

The project had significant impacts in increasing GASGI institutional capacity and strengthening the survey and geospatial Information sector.

The project was wholly aligned with GASGI's institutional objectives and within its structure. This was a key factor in project ownership and facilitated the achievement of project objectives.

The PB was not well established to serve as an effective project management body. It should include a technical expert who will be able to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project.

The M&E plan was not sufficiently detailed, and therefore the M&E process was not very effective.

The documenting and sharing learning activities were treated as an "add-on" to technical delivery. Therefore the knowledge generated by the project was not proactively captured, disseminated, and used to inform management decisions.

Reporting requirements were too sophisticated for this type of project.

There was good communication between UNDP and the NPM, but both needed better communication with the technical team.

The project results were not publicly visible on the GASGI website or another platform.

## Recommendations

#### **Recommendations Related to Project Design**

The project governance and management arrangements should be improved to ensure the project objectives are delivered efficiently and effectively. For that purpose, TORs should be prepared for the PB, NPM, and PIU, and the PIU should be strengthened by a technical advisor who will support it in ensuring the high quality of the project outputs.

The M&E plan should be prepared with specific and measurable performance indicators, timeframe, and clearly allocated responsibilities for collecting the data for each indicator.

The project strategy should be reassessed to define the stakeholder involvement properly. For that purpose, the Project Document should include a carefully prepared section outlining all the main relevant stakeholders, including their roles and functions/mandate, interest in the project, and form of participation.

The project scope and results framework should be reviewed and redefined through a highly participatory process involving technical experts from all departments supposed to produce deliverables. The activities not completed within this project should be carried forward into the new project.

The project should foresee measures to address gender inequalities, disability, and social inclusion issues relevant to the results and activities.

#### **Recommendations Related to Annual Planning and Execution**

The annual work plans should be defined precisely in a participatory process involving all concerned departments to ensure proper reporting and focus activities. The plans should be prepared with the flexibility to adjust activities according to institutional demands.

The technical advisors hired with the support of UNDP should be implicitly included in the annual work plans and should be requested to submit parallel reports to UNDP yearly.

The PIU should: (1) Systematically assess the project progress according to the M&E plan and report the evaluation data in the progress reports when rated as critical; (2) Strengthen risk management by regularly monitoring project risk and updating the risk log as required in the PD; (3) Improve the knowledge management and communication as required by the M&E Plan; (4) Carry out strong financial management and employ an appropriate system to track, record and report project expenses against the budget.

#### **Recommendations Related to Project Reporting**

The PIU should carry out regular project reporting by submitting quarterly progress reports.

The PIU should produce a single comprehensive annual report that meets all annual reporting requirements for the project. For that purpose, a template and minimum requirements for the content of the APR should be imposed.

#### **Recommendations Related to Project Collaboration**

The project should implement a Web-Based Collaboration Platform to empower team members' use of online tools for collaboration and sharing. The platform will (1) provide a single communication hub where all project documents, software, and documentation are stored in one enterprise repository; (2) notify users about content and conversations they should be involved and (3) allow users to create tasks, assign tasks and notify others of the assignment.

#### **Recommendations Related to Project Visibility**

Information about the project and its results should be uploaded to the GASGI's website to increase the project visibility.

To promote wider visibility, GASGI should establish a partnership with national television for the production of communication messages, audiovisual documentaries, and clips.

GASGI and UNDP should promote the dissemination of the project products in the country and international meetings.

#### **Recommendations Related to the GASGI New Mandate**

To ensure effective delivery of the new mandate GASGI should:

Complete the work on the transformation plan addressing the Agency's short- and long-term goals. This plan should be comprehensive enough to include a business case, outcomes, actions, milestones, target metrics, funding requirements, and training.

Develop a stakeholder engagement strategy including the vision and objectives of stakeholder engagement and the details of purpose, players, methods, and responsibility.

Develop a gender equity strategy articulating the priorities for advancing gender equity across the organization and achieving Vision 2030 goals.

Continue to develop the national geospatial data framework by promoting common classifications, content standards, data models, and other components facilitating data development, sharing, and use in a way that recognizes the need for compatibility with relevant international best practices and aligns with the government's broader data policy approach and priorities.

Increase the amount of geospatial data accessible and free to use while mitigating security, ethical, and privacy risks.

Ensure that the data provided through the NCGD/GIC is findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable, and of high quality by preparation of a comprehensive data catalog; setting clear guidelines on data access; enhancing capabilities, skills, and awareness of data users; and attracting the private sector to share data.

Take an active role in identifying the opportunities and barriers to using and sharing geospatial data to drive economic growth and improve services to citizens and customers.

Prepare recommendations for policy interventions to support growth, competition, and innovation, based on the ongoing geospatial data market study.

## **Lessons Learned**

Considering the technical nature of this project, the inclusion of a technical expert in the PIU is vital to ensure proper planning, implementation, and coherence of results. He/she will provide guidance, quality assurance and will be a source of continued technical support.

Facilitated communication and collaboration between UNDP, PIU, and technical staff and continuous monitoring of the outputs of each activity are crucial for the establishment of an efficient implementation mechanism and effective risk management.

The project governance and management arrangements should establish an efficient and effective project management mechanism. This can be significantly facilitated by preparing TOR for the Project Board, National Project Manager, and PIU.

To ensure the mainstreaming of gender considerations, the gender-based expected results, indicators, and targets should be identified during the project design. Once part of the project strategy and monitoring framework, they will become part of the project implementation and reporting.

The project will benefit from the more active involvement of UNDP on the technical side. This will put UNDP in a stronger position to provide better oversight and monitoring to the project and better support services for revision of substantive studies to check their quality and assistance in getting exposed to best practices under the AWP. This may require an extension of the Implementation Support Services provided under the NIM.

The M&E system itself should be closely monitored and updated regularly during the life of the project. That was not done for this project, and the project delivered only part of the expected outputs.

# **Report Content**

This report contains 10 sections: **Introduction and Overview** provides a general introduction to the evaluation; **Description of the Project being Evaluated** provides the basis to understand the design, general logic, results framework (theory of change) and other relevant information of the project; **Evaluation Scope and Objectives** explains the evaluation scope, primary objectives and main questions; **Evaluation Approach and Methods** describes the selected methodological approaches and methods; **Data Analysis** describes the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions; **Findings** and **Conclusions** set out the evaluation findings, based on analysis of the data collected, and the conclusions drawn; **Recommendations** proposes actions to be taken or decisions to be made, along with the possible consequences; **Lessons Learned** provides the lessons from this evaluation; **Annexes** include: TOR for the evaluation, evaluation matrix and data collection instruments, list of individuals or groups interviewed, interview questions, Project Document, Substantive Project and Budget Revision, survey questionnaire and list of supporting documents reviewed.

## **Introduction and Overview**

This section introduces the evaluation purpose, structure, methodology, and the key issues addressed.

## **Purpose of the Evaluation**

This evaluation was carried out following the guidance, rules, and procedures established by UNDP with the purpose:

- To assess the alignment of the project with the national development priorities, the UNDP country program and strategic plan, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- To analyze the project design, implementation strategy, approaches, challenges, and the extent to which these contributed to the achievement of project objectives.
- To assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments.
- To identify lessons that can help improve the design and implementation of a new project supporting GASGI under the strategic partnership.

The evaluation was done before the project end to inform the preparation of a new project with GASGI under the strategic partnership.

## **Key Issues Addressed**

To assess the project performance and rationale, the evaluation used the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria:

• **Relevance:** the extent to which the project objectives and design respond to global and national needs, policies, and priorities, and those of beneficiaries and partner institutions, taking into consideration changes over time.

- **Coherence:** the extent to which the project fits with other country, sector, or institution interventions.
- Effectiveness: the extent to which the project achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and results.
- Efficiency: The extent to which the project results have been delivered in an economical and timely way.
- **Sustainability:** the extent to which the benefits of the project continue or are likely to continue after the project.
- **Impact:** the extent to which the project has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

## **Methodology of the Evaluation**

The methodology for this evaluation included the following components:

#### Preparation

The evaluator carried out an extensive review of documentation, including the Project Document (PD), Substantive Project and Budget Revision (SBPR) document, Annual Work Plans (AWPs), Annual Project Reports (APRs), Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs), Minutes of Meeting of Project Board, a wide variety of GASGI technical documents and other relevant information. The list of documents studied is provided in Annex 8 of the report.

The desk review phase included emailing and virtual meetings with the Evaluation Manager and GASGI representatives to arrange the data collection mission.

An Evaluation Inception Report was prepared with a schedule of meetings, key milestones, evaluation matrix, and details of the evaluation methodology to be followed.

#### **Data Collection Mission**

At the beginning of the mission, a meeting was held with the Evaluation Manager (EM), the UNDP Resident Representative (RR), and project staff to discuss UNDP's perceptions of the project's achievements, constraints and review the mission program.

Further, a meeting with the GASGI President and the NPM was held together with the EM.

These initial meetings were followed by meetings with representatives of various GASGI departments arranged by the NPM. These included: General Department of Hydrographic Survey, General Department of Geodesy, General Department of Map Production, and NCGD/GIC.

In total, interviews and/or meetings were held with 14 GASGI representatives involved in different capacities with the project (see Annex 3 and Annex 4).

To get opinions from key stakeholders in the geospatial sector, a questionnaire was prepared and provided for distribution by the NPM (Annex 5).

On the fifth day of the mission, the initial findings were presented to the UNDP EM, GASGI management represented by the President and his two advisors (one of them also General Supervisor of Organizational Excellence), and the NPM. This led to further discussions, clarification of different points, and feedback.

#### **Preparation of Draft Evaluation Report**

Follow-up was carried out with the UNDP CO and the NPM to obtain pending documents and request clarification on some issues. Additional material was reviewed with focused attention on project outcomes and outputs. A detailed analysis of the data was undertaken, and the findings were consolidated into a Draft Evaluation Report. The draft was prepared following the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines and TOR for this evaluation (see Annex 1).

The draft was then submitted for review to UNDP. Upon receiving the consolidated UNDP and GASGI comments, a debriefing was done with UNDP, the additions and comments were incorporated, and a Final Evaluation Report was prepared.

#### **Structure of the Evaluation**

The structure of this evaluation followed the Terms of Reference (TOR) (see Annex 1) and UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. Also followed were the UNDP evaluation policy and UNEG norms and standards.

# Description of the Project being Evaluated

The theory of change for this project accepts that the effective use of geospatial data and technologies to collect, manage, analyze, model, and visualize geographic data can improve data-driven decisionmaking in all sectors of the economy. This can be achieved through comprehensive capacity building, enhanced institutional effectiveness, efficient service delivery, and forged partnership among stakeholders in the geospatial sector. Within this framework, the NCGD/GIC will enrich the short-tomedium-term planning and decision-making along with a strong tendency towards globalization. Such a tendency will strengthen the competitiveness of the national economy.

This project is a key element of the strategic partnership between GASGI and UNDP to strengthen and promote the survey and geospatial information sector and create partnerships to market various survey products of the Authority.

The project was implemented under the National Implementation (NIM) modality, whereby GCS assumed implementation responsibility with UNDP Implementation Support Services for recruitment of international and national advisors and other activities as noted in the AWP. Activities were managed through a standard Project Board mechanism, which served as a steering body to ensure the coherence of all activities under the project. UNDP provided technical advisory support to all activities through the UNDP CO in Riyadh.

The project's key objective in line with the priorities of the UNDP Country Program is the provision of advisory services in developing national capacity for effective geospatial surveys and geospatial information activities and the generation of multi-purpose knowledge. This is expected to boost the national efforts in achieving the key directions of the Saudi Vision 2030 and promote the national implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. The project contributes to the key objective by supporting GCS/GASGI to carry out the activities under its mandate effectively and efficiently.

The nature of the project is such that there were no specific geographical areas covered and no adverse impacts on marginalized and vulnerable groups or any other group of the population.

The project's first phase contributed to building a foundation of financial sustainability, allowing the General Commission of Survey (GCS) to achieve a high-efficiency level in all hydrographical and

geospatial products. The core output was designing and operationalizing an NCGD/GIC, enabling GCS to expand marketing and broaden public awareness about its products and services.

In 2020, the mandate of GCS was extended to include more regulatory, supervising, and monitoring functions, and the authority was renamed to General Authority of Survey and Geospatial Information.

The project's current phase seeks to improve the national capacities for production, collection, and processing of geospatial information and increase the effectiveness of its use in the Kingdom. The project is expected to provide the Kingdom, represented by the Authority, with an opportunity to benefit from international best practices for developing and using geospatial data and methods.

The project period considered by this evaluation was May 1, 2018 - October 28, 2021. It entirely covered all project outputs, except Output 4, with two remaining months to complete.

## Project Start, Expected Duration, and Funding

The Project Document (Annex 6) was signed on May 14, 2018, with a planned 1 year and 11-month implementation period and a closure date of April 30, 2021. The total resources committed by the Government of Saudi Arabia for this project were USD 4,933,749. The GCS was the entity that had overall responsibility for implementing the project. A Project Board was constituted, and a National Project Manager from GCS was designated for the project.

## **Project Extension**

In 2020, the mandate of GCS was revised, and GCS was renamed GASGI. The Resolution for establishing GASGI<sup>2</sup> stipulated that the Authority shall continue to carry out surveying, map production, marine maps production, geographical information, and hydrographic marine surveys it used to carry out in its capacity as the General Commission for Survey, along with conducting research and considering the better means used to provide these activities. Thus, the Authority has four basic functions for the next few years:

- Organization, upgrading, supervising, and monitoring of the survey and geospatial information sector, which is a new role for the Authority.
- Exploration of options aimed at finding a national geospatial operator to provide geospatial data and digital products and services in order to segregate the operator from the regulator and allow the Authority to focus on its role as a general authority.
- Continued provision of geospatial data, digital products, and services which is still among the Authority's tasks as the national authority responsible for driving work in the production of geospatial information for a period of up to 4 years. Hence, the Authority will continue to carry out its current role in delivering most activities until the entity that will perform the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Council of Ministers Resolution No. (90) dated 5/2/1442H approving the organization of the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information was preceded by a chain of documents including:

Council of Ministers Resolution No. (70) dated 22/4/1410H, which stipulates restricting all agencies operating in the field of surveying and producing maps, whether in government agencies or others, and collecting and concentrating all their work in one device called (Central Survey Administration), which shall be responsible for Every survey job needed by any governmental or non-governmental agency.

<sup>•</sup> Council of Ministers Resolution No. (133) dated 2/5/1422H approving the transformation of the Central Survey Administration at the Ministry of Defence into a Commission called the "General Commission for Survey" that has legal personality and an independent budget and is linked to the Minister of Défense.

<sup>•</sup> Council of Ministers Resolution No. (8) dated 14/1/1427H approving the organization of the General Commission for Survey and its organizational structure and guide in the attached formulas, and the board of directors of the Authority may - within the limits of its competence - amend the organizational guide.

operation in the future (operator) is chosen, while the departments must adhere to the requirements of the regulator.

• Provision of help in achieving the Saudi Vision 2030 Programs and objectives related to geospatial information.

In that context, a Substantive Project and Budget Revision (SPBR) (Annex 7) was made on April 30, 2021. The intend was to help GASGI meet its new mandate and finalize activities under Output 3 and Output 4 pending from the previous phase (see below).

The project was extended until December 31, 2021, and the budget was increased by USD 1,600,000 to USD 2,933,333. At the time of this evaluation, the project budget was USD 4,933,749. The additional funding was from the government budget (see F18).

## **Problems that the Project Seeks to Address**

Digital transformation is an essential part of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030. This strategic framework was developed to reduce the country's dependence on oil, diversify its economy, and develop public service sectors such as health, education, infrastructure, recreation, and tourism. Geospatial technology is a critical enabler of digital transformation. It provides a key input to the vast majority of new technologies and helps governmental operate effectively and efficiently.

Today more and more sectors integrate geospatial solutions into their workflows. This leads to a greater demand for authoritative, accurate, updated, and accessible geospatial data platforms and intensive capacity building in geospatial technology for various domains. A vital role in these tasks play the national geospatial entities, which assist the government in implementing digital transformation in the context of the geospatial sector.

The central geospatial authority in Saudi Arabia before 2020 was the GCS. It worked to develop the survey and geospatial information sector as one of the national income resources to achieve Vision 2030. GCS saw this by establishing a national data center and unification of the performance standards and means of measurement and control. This was expected to significantly reduce costs by eliminating the need for other sectors to establish geospatial data centers serving their needs only. The unification of performance standards promoted by GCS was expected to enhance the opportunities to invest in geographic information.

In 2020 GCS was succeeded by the General Authority of Survey and Geospatial Information, but the strategic vision remained the same. The project intended to help GSC/GASGI reach its strategic goal to make the geospatial sector more efficient and attractive.

# Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

The Project Development Objective is to strengthen and promote the survey and geospatial Information sector in Saudi Arabia by developing national capacity for effective geospatial surveys, data processing, data management, data use, and generation of multi-purpose knowledge that will support the achievement of Vision 2030 and the National Development Goals. The objective is pursued by supporting GCS/GASGI to deliver the following interconnected outputs:

Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized.

Output 2: National capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services.

**Output 3:** Advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy.

Output 4: Quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted;

Output 5: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS.

The last output was added with the Substantive Project and Budget Revision of 2021 (see above).

## **Expected Results**

The RRF in Section III of the PD presents the project Outputs and activities under each Output together with specific indicators, baselines, and targets (see Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, Table 7, and Table 8). According to PD, the project is expected to develop the government's national capacities "in coming up with high-quality geospatial products". The first step towards this end will be the creation of the necessary institutional arrangements, including the establishment of an NCGD/GIC. The following two steps, which will be taken simultaneously, are the capacity development program and the partnerships with the best practices worldwide. The capacity development program will commence with a set of training modules to build the strategic, leadership, and technical competencies of the GCS "in various disciplines relevant to surveying, geospatial data processing, presentation, and marketing". The PD further stipulates that a public awareness campaign will be launched "to promote the visibility of the GCS among the private sector and the civil society".

## **Main Stakeholders**

Stakeholders are not explicitly listed in the PD, but it can be assumed that these are the primary producers and users of geospatial information across the public and private sectors and civil society. The PD states that the success of the NCGD/GIC will rely "on a well-functioning system of focal points from all stakeholders". For that purpose, "a detailed focal point mechanism will be developed". "The focal persons from all sectors will be trained on methods of updating geospatial data on a timely basis, improvement of data quality and enhancement of accuracy".

# **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

The evaluation objective was to examine the impact and challenges of the project to develop national capacity in the geospatial sector and generate multi-purpose knowledge for achieving Vision 2030 and the NDGs.

The scope includes:

- Assessment of the Outputs delivered against the targets set in the PD and SBPR:
  - NCGD/GIC established and operationalized;
  - national capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services;
  - advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy;
  - quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted;
  - advocacy promoted for wider visibility of GCS.
- Identification of positive and negative experiences from the project including:
  - bottlenecks that may have impeded the delivery of the planned outputs;
  - opportunities that may have been missed;
  - opportunities arising from the GASGI new mandate.

The evaluation and derived recommendations will be used for the preparation of a new project under the strategic partnership that will support GASGI to deliver its intended task better and benefit from the lessons learned during the previous implementation.

## **Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation questions (see Annex 2) are grouped by criteria and then prioritized into a smaller number of high-level questions under which the more detailed questions will sit. The prioritization is done considering: how important they are to the stakeholders; whether they reflect the objectives of the UNDP and national policy priorities; whether they reflect critical elements of the theory of change for the project; whether their answers can address evidence gaps found by the desk review; whether they will provide information that can be useful for the preparation of a new project supporting GASGI under the strategic partnership.

The high-level key evaluation questions set for this evaluation are:

- Was the project design adequate?
- Has the project delivered the expected outputs, outcomes, and impacts?
- How efficiently was the project implemented?
- How sustainable are the project results?
- What are the lessons learned for preparing a new project supporting GASGI?

## **Evaluation Approach and Methods**

To ensure an objective and credible outcome, the evaluation was based on the project results and its theory of change, describing how activities and outputs were expected to lead to the desired outcomes. For that purpose, the evaluation examined the sequence of results, processes, and contextual factors using the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability (see above). Consideration was given to gender mainstreaming, human rights, and disability concerns.

The evaluation used a participatory and consultative approach involving the EM and GASGI at any stage of the evaluation process, from the evaluation design to data collection, analysis, and reporting.

## **Sources of Information**

The evaluation used multiple sources of information, including documents, filed information, information systems, financial records, management, staff, experts, and other stakeholders.

## **Data Collection Methods**

The evaluation employed a variety of data collection methods, including:

• Documents review of relevant documentation including but not limited to project documents; theory of change and results framework; quality assurance reports; AWPs; APPs; CDRs; minutes and highlights of PB meetings, financial data, and GCS/GASGI internal documents (Annex 8).

- Semi-structured interviews with GASGI management and technical staff designed based on evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability (Annex 3 and Annex 4).
- Survey questionnaire to stakeholders (Annex 5).

Most interview sessions were conducted face-to-face following a semi-structured format but also allowing for relevant, unplanned discussions. Notes from the interviews were filled in to assure completeness immediately following the end of each discussion. All interview notes were analyzed to identify themes in the comments related to the key evaluation questions.

The evaluation was planned to seek an answer to the question of did the project adequately considers gender equity, disability, and social inclusion issues. For that purpose, it was planned to ensure that data collected was disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories to establish how the project has mainstreamed gender issues, considered disability issues, and applied the rights-based approach. All interviews were to involve male and female participants whose anonymity and confidentiality were to be maintained, and the final evaluation report was not to assign specific comments to individuals. None of this was applied because the interviews organized by GASGI did not involve women.

It was requested in the Inception Report to establish two focus groups in order to discuss more details and achieve an equal gender split – one from GASGI and another one from key stakeholders. These focus groups, however, were not established.

The questionnaire to stakeholders was designed to ensure a good response rate and based on the evaluation questions and objectives (Annex 5). However, the survey results were not available at the time of this report.

# Data Analysis

To allow for greater confidence in the findings and triangulation of the data sources, the evaluation employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, each suitable for answering different types of evaluation questions.

Qualitative methods were used to investigate the perspectives and interpretations of participants in a holistic fashion utilizing the experience and long involvement of the evaluator in the geospatial field. The approach adopted was to measure the project performance against the intended outputs articulated in the RRF. The method was tailored to the nature and availability of the data. Project documentation and GASGI policy and priorities materials were reviewed to develop a sound understanding of the Authority and address evaluation questions related to the project. It was found that the APRs for this project were missing data to measure progress against target indicators. The 2019 report contained only information about the international experts hired with the support of UNDP. The 2020 report was entirely dedicated to the expansion of project scope related to the new mandate of GASGI. Thus a lot of information, processes, outputs, and other accomplishments were not captured. The periodic assessments of the project progress according to the M&E plan had not produced progress reports. To compensate for these gaps, it was decided to put more emphasis on interviews and secondary data sources such as internal reports and technical documents. Most of the evidence was gathered through a set of interviews with GASGI management and technical staff. In total, interviews with 14 people were conducted. Respondents were selected to obtain representation from key GASGI personnel involved in the project.

The limited set of interviews is a primary limitation to this evaluation. As a mitigation measure, findings from interviews were validated with documentation and follow-up interviews. Further, the major achievements reported by interviewees had to be validated through a questionnaire distributed by the NPM to key stakeholders. The respondents were asked to evaluate the training activities and

estimate the quality and visibility of GASGI products and services. Suggestions on how to address the geospatial skills needs and gaps in their organizations were also sought. However, the survey results were not available when this report was prepared.

Where feasible, quantitative methods (such as analyses of data) were used to acquire more specific information about the effects of the project intervention. Qualitative and quantitative methods were combined to validate findings from quantitative and qualitative data sources and to explore/augment quantitative findings using qualitative data.

# Findings

## **Project Design**

#### Alignment with National and International Priorities and Programs

F1. The project was aligned with the national development priorities<sup>3</sup>, the priorities of the UNDP Country Program<sup>4</sup>, and the UNDP Strategic Plan<sup>5</sup>. The project outputs supported eight of the UN SDGs<sup>6</sup>.

### **Project Objectives and Components, Results and Resources** Framework

- F2. The project objectives and Outputs were well designed to contribute to the desired result: the development of the "national capacities of the government in coming up with high-quality geospatial products". The project contributed to the theory of change developed for the country program outcome.<sup>7</sup>
- F3. The Strategy section of the PD would be better presented if provided a more specific and detailed description of the Outputs in order to clarify how they would be operationalized. The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) probably carried out more detailed planning on the specific activities

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Saudi Vision 2030 emphasizes the importance of geospatial information as a supportive and enabling tool for initiatives to enhance digital government and declares "We will expand the scope of current online services further to include areas such as geographic information, health care and education. Quality will be improved by streamlining processes, and diversifying communication channels. We will also support the wider use of online applications in government agencies, such as cloud applications, data sharing platforms and HR management systems. Finally, we will strengthen the governance of online services within the government itself".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Outcome 1: Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure. Output 1.1: National policies developed to promote economic diversification with a focus on increased employment of nationals.

Outcome 2: Public sector strengthened through improved efficiency, effectiveness, equity and accountability. Output 2.1: National capacities enhanced and integrated towards local adaptation and implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the National Transformation Plan (NTP).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The Strategic Plan declares that by 2021 UNDP wants to catalyse tangible progress on: "Accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, especially through innovative solutions that have multiplier effects across the Sustainable Development Goals".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> It is widely recognized that the achievement of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is highly dependent on geospatial information and enabling technologies as the primary data and tools for relating people to their location and place, and to measure 'where' progress is, or is not, being made, particularly at 'disaggregated' sub-national and local levels. To great extent this is valid for Goals 1, 2, 3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> built on the premise that higher institutional effectiveness and efficient service delivery, developed national capacities and forged partnerships translate into higher input to national economy.

to be executed under each Output, but it would nonetheless have been helpful to have had more detail upfront.

- F4. The selected indicators in the PD were "SMART"<sup>8</sup> and the RRF included specific and measurable targets for the end-of-project. To a lesser extent, this is valid for SPBR where some activities (for example, 1.6 Technical preparation for implementing the National Geodetic Reference Frame) included many different sub-activities, and additional indicators would have facilitated accountability and review. This is further complicated by measuring the achievement and progress in percentages which is an established practice for UNDP projects but is not helpful in this case.
- F5. The RRF in both documents did not specify who is responsible for each activity and in what specific timeframe. To a certain extent, that was done in SPBR, but to ensure timely and successful implementation of each activity, the responsibility should be allocated to the department level, and a precise timeframe for implementation should be given.

#### **Cross-cutting Issues**

F6. The project did not foresee measures to address gender inequalities, disability, and social inclusion issues relevant to the results and activities.

#### **Risks and Assumptions**

- F7. The PD identified two main risks without ranking. These included:
  - Difficulty in smooth coordination across sectors and regions.
  - Delays might be encountered in recruiting long-term and top-notch short-term advisors with bilingual competency (Arabic and English).

An appropriate mitigation strategy was identified for the first risk. Risks were not updated after the SPBR in April 2021.

It might have been useful to analyze the potential risks associated with:

- Activity delays due to excessive approval procedures, failure to develop a reasonable estimate of quantities, or the COVID-19 restrictions.
- Key personnel from the implementing partner overloaded and unable to participate in the project activities.
  - Changing priorities of the implementing partner due to institutional changes or differences in the national agenda resulting in limited ownership of activities.

Some of the above risks did materialize during the implementation and caused project delays.

#### **Stakeholder Participation**

F8. The Stakeholder Involvement section in the PD stated that the "overall impact of the intervention is projected to reach all population of Saudi Arabia and in terms of both the existing generation and the future ones". It did not identify specific stakeholders that might have an interest in increasing capacity and knowledge in geospatial data management. To some extent, this was done in section Project Management which envisaged the establishment of a system of focal points from all stakeholders through which "the focal persons from all sectors will be trained on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound.

methods of updating geospatial data on a timely basis, improvement of data quality and enhancement of accuracy".

The PD would have benefitted from an extended Stakeholder Involvement section outlining all the main relevant stakeholders, including their roles and functions/mandate, interest in the project, and form of participation.

#### Sustainability

- F9. The project design ensured sustainability in developing the survey and geospatial sector in KSA as a national income source. Several factors determined this:
  - The project RRF was well aligned with the national priorities and government strategies which generates high-level political and institutional support during and beyond the project.
  - The project included intensive capacity building of key stakeholders in the geospatial sector and was aimed at developing a focal point mechanism allowing focal persons from all sectors to be trained on various aspects. These factors have a continuous effect and will help build synergies among the key stakeholders.
  - The establishment of an NCGD/GIC providing data and services to the entire geospatial sector will have a positive effect lasting far beyond the project duration.
  - Unification of the performance standards and means of measurement within the project supports the adoption of new work processes within the geospatial sector leading to improved services and better operation of the work units in the long term.

#### **Project Management and Governance**

F10. The project management structure outlined in the PD included:

- Project Board (PB) of high-level representatives from GASGI and UNDP established to review
  performance based on monitoring and evaluation and address implementation issues to
  ensure quality delivery of results. PB was responsible for making consensual management
  decisions when the NPM required guidance. At the time of this evaluation, members of the
  PB were the NPM (Executive and Senior Beneficiary) and the UNDP RR (Senior Supplier).
- The PB was supported in the project oversight and monitoring by a Project Assurance team composed of the UNDP Team Leader for Governance and a similar level government representative from GASGI.
- The NPM was a senior official of GASGI (General Director Human Resources) with the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf and within the constraints laid by the PB.
- F11. As mentioned above (F8), the Project Management section in PD envisaged the establishment of a system of focal points from all stakeholders, but there was no mechanism to involve them in the management process.

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation Design**

F12. The Monitoring Plan was designed to cover key activities, such as results tracking (quarterly), monitoring and managing risk (quarterly), learning and knowledge sharing (at least annually), project quality assurance (annually), project reviews, and coarse corrections (at least annually), project reports (annually).

F13. The M&E plan would have been more effective if identified who is responsible for collecting the data for each indicator.

## **Project Implementation**

#### Implementation, Execution, and Coordination

F14. This project was implemented under the National Implementation Modality (NIM), where UNDP provided Implementation Support Services (ISS) for recruitment of international and national advisors and other activities as noted in the AWP while GCS/GASGI assumed implementation responsibility with the UNDP ISS. In that context, direct payments were made from the UNDP bank account, but GCS/GASGI assumed responsibility for the contracting process and performed recruitment or procurement according to its own rules and regulations. UNDP assumed the responsibility for support services based on UNDP rules and regulations.

#### **UNDP Country Office Support**

F15. The UNDP CO support was considered by GASGI as effective, efficient, and essential.

- The ISS provided by UNDP CO under NIM included: revision of substantive studies to check their quality, recruitment of short- and long-term experts, assistance in getting exposed to best practices, procurement of professional services and equipment. The procurement of goods and services and the recruitment of personnel by the UNDP CO were in accordance with the UNDP regulations, rules, policies, and procedures.
- UNDP CO participated in the PB and provided project assurance (see F10).

#### GASGI

- F16. GASGI, as the Implementing Partner, performed its functions in accordance with the provisions of the PD and has the administrative and technical capacity to implement this project. GASGI has experience implementing international projects and has established relationships with various stakeholders across the geospatial sector, which played a beneficial role in the project execution.
- F17. The PIU consisted of the National Project Manager only (who is also the General Director Human Resources of GASGI). The NPM was seen by UNDP CO to have employed a professional, organized, and systematic approach to project execution. It demonstrated leadership and had the ability to mobilize key actors and develop partnerships. GASGI technical staff interviewed concurred that the NPM provided regular support and a high level of communication. In turn, the technical staff provided updates consolidated by the NPM to prepare annual project reports.

According to PD, the "National Project Manager's prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost".

- The M&E functions for this project included regular submission of Quarterly Progress Reports, Quarterly Risk Logs, Annual Lessons-learned Reports, and Annual Review Reports. These responsibilities were not explicitly allocated to NPM in the Monitoring Plan.
- The NPM functions to monitor and control the project's budgetary execution should be better defined.
- The NPM should be supported by a technical expert in the geospatial field to perform better.

#### Finance

F18. The total project budget was USD 4,933,749. At the time of the final evaluation, the project had spent 69.3% of its budget. Table 1 shows the annual budget allocations.

Year	Annual Budget
2018	0
2019	2,000,416
2020	1,333,333
2021	1,600,000
Total Budget	4,933,749

Table 1. Annual Budget Allocations in USD.

F19. The total resources initially allocated to the project by the Government of Saudi Arabia (GOSA) under the PD were USD 800,000. That amount was increased by USD 1,600,000 with the SBPR. Table 2 shows amounts per Output in the original PD and SBPR.

Table 2. Summary of amounts per Output in PD and SBPR in USD.

Description	PD	After SBPR
Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized.	360,000	725,000
Output 2: Capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services.	255,000	1,203,910
Output 3 Advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy.	135,000	
Output 4: Quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted.		784,452
Output 5: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS.		
NIM Audit	10,000	25,000
General Management Support	24,000	85,437
Direct Project Costing (DPC)	16,000	109,534
Total Budget	800,000	2,933,333

The budget increase to USD 4,933,749 came from additional funding from the government.

No information was available for the expenditures per Output and per year compared to the amounts allocated.

#### **Experts hired under Project**

F20. GASGI appreciated UNDP's capacity to recruit appropriate experts who provided a significant contribution to institutional capacity building. In total, 21 experts had been hired on one-year contracts under the project, including:

Number	National/International	Position	
8	National	Advisor	
5	National	Survey and Geospatial Works Advisor	
1	National	Business Service Department Advisor	
1	National	GASGI President Advisor for Transformation	
1	National	Geographical Names and Mapping Advisor	
1	International	GIS Expert	
1	International	Hydrographic Expert	
1	International	Hydrographic Survey Specialist	
1	International	Party Chief, HSV Sultan, GCS Vessel	
1	International	Senior Advisor for the General Director of GDG	

Table 3. Experts hired under the Project.

The international experts were on payroll by UNDP and were selected based on TOR prepared by GASGI. The national experts had contracts with the government and were paid via a request for direct payment.

F21. The work of the technical advisors hired with the support of UNDP was not directly linked to the project outputs. During the evaluation, they provided information that was considered as an addition to the APR. In some cases, it was difficult to determine if the advisor's input was precisely aligned with the project scope.

#### Adaptation to Changes

- F22. During the project implementation period, there were institutional changes when the mandate of GCS was extended to include more regulatory, supervising, and monitoring functions, and the authority was renamed to GASGI. That did not have a negative impact on the project because the project scope was extended beyond the initial focus, and an additional budget was allocated to the new Output. The positive impacts and opportunities were that the project extension:
  - provided an opportunity for the completion of the planned project activities and deliverables;
  - allowed GASGI to develop a transformation plan and a marketing strategy for the expansion of services;
  - provided time for building a training framework for the geospatial sector and thus increasing the sustainability of the project results;

• assisted in building the GASGI institutional capacity.

#### **Stakeholders**

F23. The project developed a system of focal points for the involvement of stakeholders in training activities on methods of updating geospatial data on a timely basis, improvement of data quality, and enhancement of accuracy. There is no information if stakeholders were consulted for the preparation of the training program.

## **Project Results**

The evaluation findings are presented in a separate section for each Output. The section starts with a table summarizing the achievements, followed by a more detailed explanation cross-referenced in the table.

Formal project outputs do not tell the whole story about the project progress. Many outputs were not generated directly from pre-specified activities. The technical experts hired with the support of UNDP provided everyday assistance in developing the capabilities of GASGI to reach a high-performance standard. These achievements are also presented in the relevant sections but are not cross-referenced in the table.

As detailed below, many of the targets set in the PD were met in terms of produced documents. However, fewer workshops were held, primarily because of the Covid restrictions and lockdowns. The degree of completion for the activities added with SBPR is less than planned. In this sense, the SPBR Work Plan may have been overly ambitious in terms of the expected targets.

#### **Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized.**

	Level			Cross	
Indicator	Baseline	Project End	28.10.21	Reference	
NCGD/GIC structured and implemented.	0	1	1	F24	
Geospatial database designed and populated.	0	1	IP	F27	
Number of staff recruited and trained for the NCGD/GIC.	0	35	35	F25	
Models of data simulation developed.	0	250	IP	F26	
Geospatial datasets simulated.		100%	N/A		
Technical preparation for the implementation of the National Geodetic Reference Frame completed.		100%	100%	F28	
<b>Note:</b> Underlined are revisions and additions made with the Substantive Budget and Project Revision document of			document of		

Table 4. Level of Achievement of Output 1 based on Project Indicators.

- F24. The NCGD/GIC was structured and implemented through an appropriate organizational design and governance structure with job descriptions, a chain of command, and reporting lines.
- F25. The planned new staff was recruited. They all had the necessary background and experience to perform the work of the assigned position. Part of the NCGD/GIC staff attended training programs. However, more human resources are still needed, especially on the experts and senior level, to complete the remaining activities.
- F26. GASGI prepared a document titled "Data Modeling Methodology and Principle" defining the conceptual framework, methodology, modeling principles, and rules for developing Data Models. The document outlines the mechanism for creating consistent KSA Foundation Theme Data Models and provides the framework to manage, maintain and update the Data Models over time. It is aimed at data modelers with the purpose is to ensure that Data Models are developed following well-defined rules which can be validated. Together with the Generic Conceptual Model, the document is expected to be the foundation for the development of consistent data specifications for the 12 Foundation Themes: Land Parcels, Imagery, Water, Geology, Elevation, Land Cover, Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System, Land Use, Geographical Names, Transport, Administrative, and National Address.
- F27. A geospatial database was designed and populated based on a unified data model. The work on a National Physical model and its components was still in progress.
- F28. GASGI published Technical Summary for Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System. It describes the National Geodetic Reference Frame, National Vertical Reference Frame, and National Geoid Model. The information is essential for all positional and spatial data collection activities in the Kingdom, such as surveying, mapping, remote sensing, geo-informatics, geospatial information, geomatics engineering, architecture engineering and construction, research, and development.
- F29. GASGI started with good progress initiatives and activities related to the establishment of a National Geospatial Data Infrastructure, at which core is the NCGD/GIC. That included: the creation of a National Geospatial Platform, development of National Geospatial Standards, creation of a Geospatial Data Governance framework, and Geospatial Data Dissemination initiatives. Developed and updated were key and guiding standards and controls of the sector to achieve integrated and adequate use of the geospatial information system among the stakeholders.

# Output 2: National capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services.

 Indicator
 Level
 Cross Reference

 Baseline
 Project End
 28.10.21

 Comprehensive training package formulated on survey specialties: law of the sea; land survey; geodetic survey; and cadastral survey.
 100%
 N/A

Table 5. Level of Achievement of Output 2 based on Project Indicators.

Five workshops convened for extensive training on hydrographical survey, and oceanographic science.	0	5	5	F30
Six workshops conducted on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sectors' institutions.	0	6	N/A	
Four training workshops conducted on land survey, geodetic survey; topographic survey and hydrographical survey.	0	4	N/A	
Capacity building and awareness initiatives launched for using the NGRF.		100%	IP	F31

Note:

Underlined are revisions and additions made with the Substantive Budget and Project Revision document of March 3, 2021.

N/A indicates that information is not available or not provided.

*IP indicates work in progress.* 

- F30. The five scheduled workshops for extensive training on hydrographical<sup>9</sup> survey and oceanographic science were convened. They were in the form of on-the-job training for the assigned GASGI Hydrographic Surveyors who rotate on/off the ship on a fourteen-day rotation schedule. This training covered all the professional areas of equipment and sensor deployment, sensor calibration, digital operating systems, multi-sensor data acquisition, data cleaning, tide application, and integrated product output. The workshops were not held onboard the vessel Sultan due to it being an industrial work space. However, ship-borne training from the two UNDP Experts to the GASGI personnel was delivered as a continuous "knowledge transfer" during the ongoing prosecution of the real-time hydrographic surveying operations.
- F31. As noted in F28, GASGI published Technical Summary for Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System (SANRS), which provided a solid base for launching activities for capacity building and awareness rising on the use of the NGRF.
- F32. The technical advisors hired with the support of UNDP contributed to this Output as follows:
  - The professional services by the Hydrographic Specialists are fully committed to the continuous daily "knowledge transfer" to GASGI Hydrography Department, on all aspects hydrographic, to promote and advance the capacity development of the Authority.
  - The Hydrographic Survey Specialist at the Authority's headquarters provided everyday continuous "knowledge transfer" within GASGI's three primary internal Hydrography Departments, namely Operations and Training, Marine Cartography, and Marine Sciences. This knowledge transfer was across all levels of management and all hydrographic activities and operational issues, including bathymetry cleaning, tide application, chart production, UNCLOS, Territorial Sea Baselines, equipment purchases, project technical specifications, and satellite technologies.
  - The GIS expert at the Geographical Names Department provided training to the GIS Team on GIS tools and techniques for quality checking, preparation of data for fieldwork, final QC on data submitted by contractors, and preparation of a QC report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Instead of "hydrographical" the PD uses the term "hydrological".

- Under the supervision of the Chief Senior Advisor to the General Supervisor-Technical Affairs has been established an expert team from three GDG departments with the task to resolve problems in the field of Geodetic Survey and Geodetic Earth Observation, provide guidance to the management of various GDG departments and transfer highly professional knowledge and experience to GDG staff. With the advisor's help, GDG set a training methodology based on three main pillars: General Training, Training through GDG Projects, and Training before Field Tasks.
  - The General Training was planned to raise the knowledge and experience of GDG employees with general geodetic activities. This training included theoretical and practical exercises which would improve field survey planning, observation and processing, and maintenance of surveying instruments.
  - Training through GDG Projects was planned to be delivered by contractors implementing GDG projects to enhance the skills of GDG staff by real-life examples of field data collection and the use of different software packages for QC and data processing. That included the Airborne Gravity project and the KSA-GRF17 realization project by IGN.
  - Training before Field Tasks was planned to be delivered to each GDG employee assigned with a field task. The program included theoretical instructions and practical exercises before going to the field. That included training on making gravity measurements for the Airborne Gravity project in the Flying Restricted Areas and on GNSS observations using the KSA-CORS network to test the new geoid model (KSA-GEOID21).

Besides these three pillars, the training plan included everyday technical advice and support to the management and participation and giving presentations at conferences.

# Output 3: Advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy.

Indicator	Level			Cross
	Baseline	Project End	28.10.21	Reference
Desk review of best practices in financial sustainability.	0	3	N/A	
Study conducted on marketing of the geospatial data products.	0	1	IP	F34
Assessment done for potential contribution of the GCS to the national economy.	1	2	IP	F34
Action plans formulated towards financial sustainability.	0	3	IP	F35
Nata				

Table 6. Level of Achievement of Output 3 based on Project Indicators.

Note:

Underlined are revisions and additions made with the Substantive Budget and Project Revision document of March 3, 2021.

N/A indicates that information is not available or not provided. IP indicates work in progress.

- F33. Based on the foundations of financial sustainability set in the first phase of this project, through which the GASGI is expected to achieve a high level of efficiency in all marine survey and geospatial information products, the Authority expanded the scope of marketing its products and raising public awareness of its works. With this purpose GASGI Initiated:
  - a study to examine the development of a competitive geospatial market, a regulatory environment, and potential investments and
  - a study to examine the economic value estimations for geospatial information and technologies in the Saudi economy.
- F34. GASGI initiated a study to examine and analyze its current position to develop the survey and geospatial sector in KSA as a national income source. With its current mandate, the Authority is in a position to regulate, promote, supervise and control the sector (except for work related to the Ministry of Defense) to achieve quality, improve performance and maintain security aspects in coordination with the other stakeholders.
- F35. At the time of this evaluation, GASGI was in preparation of an action plan to rationalize spending and promote the sector by approving the pricing and fees of any work, product, service, license, or permit that the Authority grants to concerned authorities. GASGI also intended to develop legislation, monitor the survey and geospatial information sector, enhance and standardize the performance standards, means of measurement and control, and significantly reduce spending costs due to implementing similar projects without coordination.

All activities under this Output are still in progress with the active participation of the experts hired with the support of UNDP.

# Output 4: Quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted.

Indicator	Level			Cross
	Baseline	Project End	28.10.21	Reference
Study conducted to scope the geospatial market size and the feasibility of geospatial products and services.		100%	IP	F36
Formulated marketing strategy.		100%	IP	F36
Developed annual plans for implementation of the marketing strategy.		100%	IP	F36
Created plan for transforming GASGI as per the new mandate.		100%	IP	F36

Table 7. Level of Achievement of Output 4 based on Project Indicators.

<u>Conducted sector related studies for</u> implementation of the marketing strategy.		100%	N/A		
Designed plan for investments attraction.		100%	N/A		
Participation in international events of relevance to excellence in geospatial performance.		100%	N/A		
<b>Note:</b> Underlined are revisions and additions made with the Substantive Budget and Project Revision document of March 3, 2021. N/A indicates that information is not available or not provided.					

- *IP indicates work in progress.*
- F36. These activities were reported as still in progress. They were added with the SBPR, but no strategy was outlined in the document.

#### Output 5: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS.

Table 8. Level of Achievement of Output 5 based on Project Indicators.

Indicator	Level			Cross
	Baseline	Project End	28.10.21	Reference
Public awareness programm formulated and implemented.	1	1	N/A	
Communication messages developed and delivered.	1	12	IP	F37
Note:				

Underlined are revisions and additions made with the Substantive Budget and Project Revision document of March 3, 2021.

N/A indicates that information is not available or not provided.

*IP indicates work in progress.* 

F37. Multiple workshops, messages, tweets, tv interviews were done. For example, in September 2021, the Authority organized a symposium entitled "Polling the Private sector's Views on the Development of the Surveying, Geospatial Information, and Imaging Sector". It was the first of a series of meetings with the private sector and relevant authorities. A workshop followed the symposium to discuss the launch of a national geospatial infrastructure program to ensure the integration and sharing of geospatial data between government agencies and the private sector through the National Geospatial Platform. Nevertheless, GASGI recognizes that still more should be done according to the progress of activities related to the sector.

- F38. Outside the planned activities, GASGI coordinated several modified workshops to advance the awareness of and broader visibility of the Authority to the national stakeholders and general audience. These included:
  - On the World Hydrography Day celebrated every year on 21 June to highlight the importance of hydrography and its impact on national/international trade, fisheries, tourism, recreation, and all offshore activities. GASGI Hydrography Department promoted itself through multimedia outlets (newspapers, television, Twitter, and YouTube) and recently by virtual online workshops involving national stakeholders and international hydrographic companies.
  - An in-kingdom workshop was conducted with IC-ENC in August 2019 to transfer the understanding of the IC-ENC's processes of validation, production support, dissemination, and revenue management to promote the extensive Red Sea chart folio, managed by GASGI, in compliance with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Regulations for use by the Maritime World.

## **Monitoring and Evaluation**

- F39. The monitoring plan was not fully implemented, which may have affected the project's achievements. Two negative factors mainly caused this:
  - Lack of allocation of responsibility for M&E in the PD.
  - Lack of clear definitions of indicators and parameters after the SPBR.

These factors did not allow the RRF to be used effectively to guide the project implementation and plan activities.

The implementation was as follows:

- The project progress was not monitored continuously, the risk log was not actively maintained, and relevant lessons were not captured regularly to inform management decisions.
- The APRs were brief and did not enable to measure progress against target indicators because a lot of information, processes, outputs and other accomplishments were not captured.
- The project quality was assessed in August 2021 against the UNDP's quality standards to identify the project strengths and weaknesses and inform management decision-making to improve the project. The results will eventually be used for the preparation of a new project under the strategic partnership that will support GASGI.

## Efficiency

- F40. The project was efficient in its use of resources to achieve expected results. This was due to several factors:
  - the high levels of participation of experts and personnel from GASGI significantly augmented the impacts that the project was able to have with the resources available;
  - the project benefitted from additional government financing of USD 2,533,749, which exceeded the original projection in the PD;
  - the project worked in partnership with other GASGI projects to maximize synergies and reduce costs.

## **Ownership**

F41. The institutional ownership of this project is high. This is easily understandable because of the GASGI role as Implementing Partner and since most of the work was done by GASGI employees.

## Coherence

F42. The project was coherent with other interventions at various levels to build national capacities, enable digital transformation, and develop a unified database to help governments operate effectively and efficiently. In this context, GASGI established partnerships with the Ministry of Municipal and Rural Affairs, Ministry of Environment Water & Agriculture, State Properties General Authority, Saudi Post, etc.

At the institution level, the project has clear synergies with other projects within GASGI, such as Geospatial Data Governance, National Spatial Reference System, and Hydrography projects.

## **Sustainability**

- F43. The project enhanced the strategic, product, personnel, and financial sustainability of GASGI that will have a long-term effect extending beyond the project end.
- F44. No substantial risks were noted in the legal frameworks, policies, accountability systems, governance structures, and processes that could jeopardize project benefits' sustainability.
- F45. The data collection mission interviews demonstrated strong institutional support to sustain project outcomes and continue the strategic partnership to support GASGI.

## Conclusions

- C1. The project had significant impacts in increasing GASGI institutional capacity and strengthening the survey and geospatial Information sector:
  - The project contributed to establishing and operationalizing the NCGD/GIC and creating a
    geospatial database within the structure of the National Geospatial Platform to support the
    business functions of GASGI and the services that GASGI is intended to provide to external
    users.
  - GASGI was supported in reaching financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy, enhancing the quality of geospatial services and products, and gaining higher visibility and a greater marketing reach.
  - The project contributed to increasing the national capacity in survey specialties by preparing key technical documents, raising public awareness, delivering training courses, and holding workshops in various fields.
- C2. The project employed several best practices in technical fields, which should be taken into consideration by other projects to maximize effectiveness and impact. For example, GASGI recruited subject matter experts to study the international best practices, promote the economy and rationalize spending.
- C3. The project was wholly aligned with GASGI's institutional objectives and within its structure. The General Director Human Resources of GASGI served as the National Project Manager. This was a key factor in project ownership and facilitated the achievement of project objectives. It also meant

that the project staff were experienced and had already established institutional relationships that enhanced project implementation.

- C4. GASGI was able to develop partnerships with many stakeholders to support achieving the project's objectives. For example, GASGI recently signed a Memorandum for Cooperation with the Ministry of Environment Water & Agriculture (MEWA), intending to make use of data, information, experiences, available capabilities, and coordination in areas of mutual interest. That was followed by a Memorandum for Cooperation with the State Properties General Authority (SPGA) for linking to the national geospatial platform. Such a link will enable SPGA to benefit from data and geospatial information to raise the efficiency of government spending.
- C5. The project was not designed and implemented to address gender inequalities, disability, and social inclusion issues relevant to the results and activities. This reduced the project's role as a transformative intervention in addition to its technical input for reaching the objectives of Vision 2030.
- C6. The PB was not well established to serve as an effective project management body. It was designed to include the National Project Manager and the UNDP Resident Representative with the idea RR to provide guidance when required by the NPM, who is one of the members. In such a composition and without a member with technical knowledge in the field, the PB cannot carry out its role and be helpful to the NPM.
- C7. The M&E plan was not sufficiently detailed, and therefore the M&E process was not very effective.
- C8. The documenting and sharing learning activities were treated as an "add-on" to technical delivery. Therefore the knowledge generated by the project was not proactively captured, disseminated, and used to inform management decisions.
- C9. Reporting requirements were too sophisticated for this type of project.
- C10. There was good communication between UNDP and the NPM, but both needed better communication with the technical team. As mentioned above, the APRs did not contain technical information to review progress, but even if it had been provided, there was no technical expert at PIU or UNDP to review it. A similar problem was seen with the advisors hired with the support of UNDP, who did not submit personal reports.
- C11. The project results were not publicly visible on the GASGI website or another platform.

## Recommendations

## **Recommendations Related to Project Design**

- R1. The project governance and management arrangements should be improved to ensure the project objectives will be delivered efficiently and effectively. For that purpose:
  - The role and responsibilities of the PB should be streamlined by preparing TOR for this body. The TOR should include the identification of members and detailed descriptions of their duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements.
  - The NPM should not be a member of the Project Board. As a governance body, the PB must be made up of people who are not working on the project and can therefore provide an objective assessment of whether the project is progressing successfully.

- The PIU should be strengthened by a Technical Advisor to support the PIU in ensuring a high quality of the project outputs and achieving the intended outcomes. The alternative of establishing a Technical Advisory Group is not feasible for this project.
- R2. The M&E plan should be prepared with specific and measurable performance indicators, timeframe, and allocated responsibilities for collecting the data for each indicator. For this project, the target values after the SPBR were given in percentages. Some activities included many different sub-activities, and additional indicators associated with practical units of measurement would have facilitated accountability and review. Who is responsible for collecting the data for each indicator in the M&E plan should be decided from the early planning stages to ensure timely reporting and decision making. This column was empty in the M&E plan for this project.
- R3. The project strategy should be reassessed to define the stakeholder involvement properly. For that purpose, the PD should include a carefully prepared section outlining all the main relevant stakeholders, including their roles and functions/mandate, interest in the project, and form of participation. Proper consideration of stakeholder involvement will contribute significantly to the successful implementation of the project.
- R4. The project scope and results framework should be reviewed and redefined through a highly participatory process involving technical experts from all departments supposed to produce deliverables.

The following activities not completed within this project should be carried forward into the new project:

- Development of a comprehensive training package of survey specialties: law of the sea, land survey, geodetic survey, topographic survey, and cadastral survey (Output 2). The package should provide a framework for course delivery in the geospatial sector. It should contain a curriculum presenting a set of competencies necessary for each activity and assessment guidelines. Each module should be provided with the learning outcomes, learning contents, suggested learning activities and resources, and finally, with assessment specifications and guidelines.
- Organization of training workshops on land survey, geodetic survey; topographic survey and hydrographical survey, and workshops for capacity building and awareness-raising about the NGRF (Output 2).
- Desk review of best practices in financial sustainability (Output 3). This review should examine barriers and facilitators to financial sustainability and synthesize best practices to reach it. It should provide the financial planning principles and framework to ensure the GASGI's priorities, the main financial issues that might be faced, and the strategy to address them. The review should identify the lessons from selected good practices to serve as a guide to the achievement of a financial sustainability of GASGI.
- Study on the marketing of geospatial data products (Output 3). This study should analyze different elements of the geospatial data market, including data collection, data management, data distribution, delivery of location-based content and services. Insight should be given onto the data market structure and the key characteristics that influence the dynamics of how it operates.
- Assessment for the potential contribution of GASGI to the national economy (Output 3). It should include the distribution of geospatial data to interested users using a range of tools and technologies and the delivery of location-based content and services to consumers.
- Formulation of an action plan towards financial sustainability (Output 3). Based on the overall strategy of GCS to strengthen the national economy, the plan should identify the
areas of intervention. For each area, the plan should define the tasks that should be undertaken to deliver the desired outputs and achieve the strategy.

- Formulation of a marketing strategy (Output 4). It should be based on tailoring the geospatial
  market to a few specific industries or use cases where GASGI solutions provide a clear
  competitive advantage; outlining the buyers; creation of a clear and concise messaging strategy
  highly tailored to each target market and buyer; building a highly visual and modern website;
  creating and distributing valuable data content, providing clients with efficient service.
- Development of annual plans for implementation of the marketing strategy (Output 4).
- Development of a plan for transforming GASGI to implement the new mandate (Output 4). The plan should include tangible milestones to be achieved to facilitate the transition of GASGI to the new mandate, including more regulatory, supervising, and monitoring functions. It should also include measures to achieve quality, improve performance, maintain security aspects and create investment opportunities in the sector in coordination with the other stakeholders.
- Development of a plan for attracting business investment (Output 4). The plan should identify the GASGI competitive advantage and develop strategy and tactics to engage key business leaders in the emerging business opportunities.
- Formulation and implementation of public awareness program (Output 5). The specific objectives should be to inform the geospatial community and public about the mandate of the Authority and the geospatial data and services it provides. The campaign should include designing and preparing information and visual materials posted on the Internet and distributed by radio, TV, and local newspapers.
- R5. The project should foresee measures to address gender inequalities, disability, and social inclusion issues relevant to the results and activities. For that purpose, UNDP should first answer whether the project presents potential opportunities to create greater gender equality and whether GASGI can manage and implement the project in a gender-sensitive way. If so, UNDP should carefully analyze gender roles in the context of the project and sector to identify root causes of existing gender inequalities and increase understanding about how to address them. The analysis should be based on gender-disaggregated data from the sector, background information, discussions with stakeholders, civil society organizations, etc. The findings should be used to refine the theory of change for the project and determine the strategy to be used to support the achievement of results from a gender perspective. Based on that, the project goal, outcomes, and outputs statement should be designed to include explicit references to gender equality. The target indicators in the RRF should be able to measure changes in gender relations. Finally, the gender-related risks and project assumptions should be identified.

It should be noted that the current government policy in Saudi Arabia is supportive of gendertransformative interventions, as the government encourages the provision of employment and training opportunities for women as a basis to reach Vision 2030's objective of increasing women's employment rate to 30%.

### **Recommendations Related to Annual Planning** and Execution

R6. To ensure proper reporting and focus activities, the annual work plans:

• should be defined precisely in a participatory process involving all concerned departments. Lack of clarity of activities means potentially poor project accountability, failures due to unrealistic targets that had not been jointly agreed upon, and poor project reporting and performance monitoring.

- should be prepared with the flexibility to adjust activities according to institutional demands, for example, saying: "additional training courses in line with the project activities may be included".
- R7. The technical advisors hired with the support of UNDP should be implicitly included in the AWPs and should be requested to submit parallel reports to UNDP on an annual basis.
- R8. The PIU should:
  - Systematically assess the project progress. The evaluation data should be regularly monitored according to the M&E plan and reported in the progress reports when rated as critical. The evaluated project was not monitored regularly, and therefore corrective actions were not taken to reduce the chance of not producing planned deliveries.
  - Strengthen risk management by regularly monitoring project risk and updating the risk log as required in the PD. If the risk was monitored and adequately managed during the project, the planned workshops could be held online to avoid delays due to the Covid restrictions.
  - Ensure women and men are provided with equal employment, training, and capacitybuilding opportunities. This should include close monitoring and adjustments to prevent the project from perpetuating or neglecting gender inequalities.
  - Improve knowledge management and communication. For that knowledge, good practices and lessons should be proactively captured, disseminated, and used to inform management decisions as required by the M&E Plan.
  - Carry out strong financial management and employ an appropriate system to track, record, and report project expenses against the budget.

### **Recommendations Related to Project Reporting**

- R9. The PIU should carry out regular project reporting by submitting quarterly progress reports.
- R10. The annual project reporting requirements should be simplified. The PIU should produce a single comprehensive annual report that meets all annual reporting requirements for the project. This will increase the ease of review and will ensure that all contextual information is provided in a single location. It is recommended to impose a template and minimum requirements for the content of the APR. At a minimum, it should include:
  - Summary communicating what progress is being made to achieve the expected outputs in the APR.
  - A table representing the results against the predefined annual targets for each activity in APP. Each row should represent an activity in 6 columns: "Expected output", "Planned activity", "Target", "Description of the result", "Statement on whether the target was reached and details on any deviation", "Expenditure". Wherever feasible, the results must be presented as gender-disaggregated data.
  - Project expenses against the budget by output.
  - Updated risk log with mitigation measures.
  - Annual lessons learned.
  - Annual project quality rating summary.
  - The results of any evaluation or review conducted over the period.

### **Recommendations Related to Project Collaboration**

- R11. The project collaboration should be improved by implementing a Web-Based Collaboration Platform, such as Confluence, ClickUp, Nifty, Trello, Nuclino, etc. This will empower team members to use online tools for collaboration and sharing. A collaboration platform:
  - Provides a single communication hub where all project documents, software, and documentation are stored in one enterprise repository.
  - Keeps all content safe and secure.
  - Allows users to share files with previewing capabilities and version control.
  - Supports notification of users about content and conversations they should be involved in.
  - Allows users to create tasks, assign tasks, and notify others of the assignment.

### **Recommendations Related to Project Visibility**

- R12. Information about the project and its results should be uploaded to the GASGI's website to increase the project visibility.
- R13. To promote wider visibility, GASGI should establish a partnership with national television for the production of communication messages, audiovisual documentaries, and clips.
- R14. GASGI and UNDP should promote the dissemination of the project products in the country and internationally. There is merit in sharing the project's experiences in implementing GRF and NGDI, creating a geospatial database, enhancing the quality of geospatial services and products, developing a national marketing strategy, increasing the national capacity in survey specialties etc. Therefore, it is recommended that GASGI encourage the presentation of articles, posters, etc., related to the project at national and international events.

# Recommendations Related to the GASGI New Mandate

To ensure effective delivery of the new mandate GASGI should:

- R15. Complete the work on the transformation plan addressing the Agency's short- and long-term goals. This plan should be comprehensive enough to include a business case, outcomes, actions, milestones, target metrics, funding requirements, and training.
- R16. Develop a stakeholder engagement strategy including the vision and objectives of stakeholder engagement and the details of purpose, players, methods, and responsibility.
- R17. Develop a gender equity strategy articulating the priorities for advancing gender equity across the organization and achieving Vision 2030 goals.
- R18. Continue to develop the national geospatial data framework by promoting common classifications, content standards, data models, and other components facilitating data development, sharing, and use in a way that recognizes the need for compatibility with relevant international best practices and aligns with the government's broader data policy approach and priorities.

- R19. Increase the amount of geospatial data accessible and free to use while mitigating security, ethical, and privacy risks.
- R20. Ensure that the data provided through the NCGD/GIC is findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable, and of high quality by:
  - preparation of a comprehensive data catalog;
  - setting clear guidelines on data access,
  - working with partners for the improvement of data and service quality and access across the geospatial sector;
  - enhancing capabilities, skills, and awareness of data users;
  - attract the private sector to share data.
- R21. Take an active role in identifying the opportunities and barriers to using and sharing geospatial data to drive economic growth and improve services to citizens and customers.
- R22. Prepare recommendations for policy interventions to support growth, competition, and innovation, based on the ongoing geospatial data market study.

### **Follow Up**

R23. UNDP should follow up on the progress of implementing the recommendations, especially for the implementation of the M&E plan, regular reporting, and stakeholder involvement.

### **Lessons Learned**

- L1. Considering the technical nature of this project, the inclusion of a technical expert in the PIU is vital to ensure proper planning, implementation, and coherence of results. He/she will provide guidance, quality assurance and will be a source of continued technical support.
- L2. Facilitated communication and collaboration between UNDP, PIU, and technical staff and continuous monitoring of the outputs of each activity are crucial for the establishment of an efficient implementation mechanism and effective risk management.
- L3. The project governance and management arrangements should establish an efficient and effective project management mechanism. This can be greatly facilitated by preparing TOR for the Project Board, National Project Manager, and PIU.
- L4. To ensure the mainstreaming of gender considerations, gender-based expected results, indicators, and targets should be identified during the project design. Once part of the project strategy and monitoring framework, they will become part of the project implementation and reporting.
- L5. The project will benefit from UNDP's more active involvement in implementing the technical side. This will put UNDP in a stronger position to provide better oversight and monitoring to the project and better support services under the AWP. This may require an extension of the Implementation Support Services provided under the NIM.
- L6. The M&E system itself should be closely monitored and updated regularly during the life of the project. That was not done for this project, and the project delivered only part of the expected outputs.

### **Annex 1: TOR for the Evaluation**

### **Final Evaluation TOR**

#### Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey DECEMBER 2021

#### **General Authority for Survey & Geospatial Information**

#### 1. Background and context

This project being evaluated represents the second phase in a strategic partnership focusing on promotion of the surveying works and the myriad products of surveying. The key objective of this intervention is to maintain provision of advisory services in developing the national capacities for effective geo-spatial surveys, generating multi-purpose knowledge from such surveys to efficiently boost national efforts in achieving the key directions of the Saudi Vision 2030 as well as promoting the national implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The completion of the previous phase has been instrumental in nurturing the idea of developing the foundation of financial sustainability whereby the General Commission of Survey (GCS) will achieve a high level of efficiency in all its hydrological and geospatial products. It is through this quality and efficiency that the GCS wishes to expand marketing of its products and to broaden the public awareness about its products and services. The core around which all aspects of this project revolve is the design and operationalizing of a National Centre for Geospatial Data.

On this basis, the project has four interconnected outputs:

- 1) National Centre for Geospatial Data established and operationalized
- 2) National capacities developed

3) Advisory services provided towards achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy

4) Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS

Capacity development will also focus on training in the core areas of land survey; geodetic survey; topographic survey' and Cadastral survey.

In 2020, the mandate of GCS was revised, and the authority renamed the general Authority of Survey and Geospatial Information (GASGI) and the mandate under the old GCS changed to become more regulatory and less implementing. Article (4) of the Statute of the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information stipulates the following:

The Authority shall regulate, develop, supervise, and monitor the Sector in the Kingdom, except for activities relating to the Ministry of Defense, in a manner that achieves quality, enhances performance, and maintains security, in coordination with relevant agencies. The Authority may undertake any measure it deems necessary to achieve its objectives, including the following:

- 1. Setting and updating rules and standards relating to the Sector to achieve integrated use of the geospatial information system among relevant agencies and to ensure compliance with said rules and standards.
- 2. Proposing relevant laws upon obtaining the approval of the Board.
- Approving and developing the national geospatial infrastructure, national geodetic reference, national geodetic networks, and marine hydrographic survey; providing and marketing Sector-related data, products, services, electronic applications, topographic and aerial maps, and marine navigational charts; and maintaining their security and confidentiality.
- 4. Developing and implementing strategic plans and conducting Sector-related studies and research in collaboration with relevant agencies.
- 5. Licensing Sector activities, overseeing the training and classification of practitioners, and setting relevant rules.

- 6. Protecting the interests of Sector stakeholders.
- 7. Developing the Sector to attract investments and enhancing its growth.
- 8. Building national capacities in the Sector, in cooperation with universities and specialized institutes within the Kingdom and abroad.
- 9. Coordinating and cooperating with its counterparts in other countries as well as relevant international agencies and organizations, in accordance with statutory procedures.
- 10. Representing the Kingdom locally and internationally, in accordance with statutory procedures.
- 11. Supervising the publication and updating of the Kingdom's Atlases and developing them in coordination with relevant agencies.
- Providing information, studies, and consultations on the Kingdom's land and maritime borders, and developing a database for such purpose in coordination with relevant agencies.
- 13. Providing Sector-related consultations and services to government and private agencies, and other entities within the Kingdom and abroad

	PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Advisory Services to the Gene	ral Commission for Survey	
Atlas ID	SAU10-110186		
Corporate outcome and output	Outcome: Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure Output: National Policies developed to promote economic diversification with increased employment of Nationals		
Country	Saudi Arabia		
Region	RBA	S	
Date project document signed	14 May	2018	
Professional dataset	Start	Planned end	
Project dates	1 May 2018	31 December 2021	
Project budget	4,933,	749	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	3,418,614		
Funding source	Governi	nent	
Implementing party <sup>1</sup>	The General Authority for Surve	ey & Geospatial Information	

#### 2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

This evaluation is the final evaluation for the afore mentioned project and comes after a 9 months extension of the project aimed at re-positioning the project to help GASGI meet its new mandate. The evaluation and ensuing recommendations will help build a new project document serving GASCI better deliver its intended task and learn lessons from previous activities.

Scope and objectives of the evaluation include:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This 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.

- Reviewing of the status of delivery of outputs as stated in the original project document:
  - National Centre for Geospatial Data established and operationalized
  - National capacities developed
  - Advisory services provided towards achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy
  - Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS
- Bottlenecks that may have impeded the delivery of the above
- Opportunities that may have been missed
- Opportunities that present themselves under the new mandate

Issues relate directly to the questions the evaluation must answer so that users will have the information they need for pending decisions or action. An issue may concern the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness or sustainability of the intervention. In addition, UNDP evaluations must address how the intervention sought to **mainstream gender in development efforts**, considered disability issues and applied the rights-based approach.

#### 3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. This section proposes the questions that, when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take actions or increase knowledge. Questions should be grouped according to the four or five OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) coherence; (c) effectiveness; (d) efficiency; and (e) sustainability (and any other criteria used).

#### Project evaluation sample questions:

#### **Relevance/ Coherence**

- To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, country programme outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the design?
- To what extent were perspectives of men and women who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during project design processes?
- To 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, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

#### Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved, considering men, women, and vulnerable groups?
- What factors have contributed to achieving, or not, 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 objectives?
- Are the project objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? Do they clearly address women, men and vulnerable groups?
- To what extent have different stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory, and is this participation of men, women and vulnerable groups contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents (men, women, other groups) and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

#### Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent were resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular?
- 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, male and female staff, 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?

#### Sustainability

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs affecting women, men and vulnerable groups?
- To what extent will targeted men, women and vulnerable people benefit from the project interventions in the long-term?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the 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 did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs, possibly affecting project beneficiaries (men and women) in a negative way? What is the chance that the level of stakeholder ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?

- 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 (men, women, vulnerable groups) support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies which include a gender dimension?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability in order to support female and male project beneficiaries as well as marginalized groups?

#### **Evaluation questions on cross-cutting issues**

#### **Human rights**

• To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women, men and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

#### **Gender equality**

All evaluation criteria and evaluation questions applied need to be checked to see if there are any further gender dimensions attached to them, in addition to the stated gender equality questions.

- 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 assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men or vulnerable groups?

#### Disability

- Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
- What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?
- What barriers did persons with disabilities face?
- Was a twin-track approach adopted?<sup>2</sup>

#### 4. Methodology

Evaluation should employ a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and male and female direct beneficiaries. Methodological tools and approaches may include:

- Document review. This would include a review of all relevant documentation, inter alia
  - Project document (contribution agreement).
  - Theory of change and results framework.
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans.
  - Activity designs.
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - Highlights of project board meetings.
  - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- Interviews and meetings with key stakeholders (men and women) such as key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, United Nations country team (UNCT) members and implementing partners:
  - Semi-structured interviews, based on questions designed for different stakeholders based on evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- Surveys and questionnaires including male and female participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires to other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.
- Gender and human rights lens. All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues, wherever applicable.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders and the evaluator.

#### 5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

These products include:

 Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages). The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.

- Evaluation debriefings. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length). A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.
- Evaluation report audit trail. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, as outlined in these guidelines. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- Final evaluation report.
- Presentations to stakeholders

#### 6. Required competencies

- Required qualifications: Advanced degree in a relevant field, a minimum of ten years' experience conducting/ managing evaluations and relevant knowledge of the field of survey and geospatial information
- Technical competencies: team leadership skills and experience, technical knowledge in UNDP thematic areas, with specifics depending on the focus of the evaluation, data analysis and report writing etc.
- Technical knowledge and experience: Gender and disability inclusion competencies preferable. Technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development.
- Language skills required: fluent English (reading, writing and spoken). Arabic a plus

Evidence to be presented:

- resume
- work samples
- references

To support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

The TOR should explicitly demand evaluators' independence from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing, or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation.<sup>3</sup>

#### 7. Evaluation ethics

Statement that evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.<sup>4</sup>

"This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For this reason, UNDP staff members based in other country offices, regional centres and headquarters units should not be part of the evaluation team.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', 2020. Access at: <u>http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866</u>

#### 8. Implementation arrangements

The section describes the specific roles and responsibilities of all involved in this evaluation:

- 1. Evaluation commissioner: The Resident Representative
- 2. Evaluation manager: Lead the evaluation process and participate in all of its stages evaluability assessment, preparation, implementation, management and use. Ensure quality assurance and manage the ERC portal
- 3. Evaluator:
  - a. Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the TOR
  - b. Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix and a gender responsive methodology, in line with the TOR, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines
  - c. Conduct data collection and field visits according to the TOR and inception report
  - d. Produce draft reports adhering to UNDP evaluation templates, and brief the evaluation manager, programme/ project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations
  - e. Consider gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, check if all and respective evaluation questions are answered, and relevant data, disaggregated by sex, is presented, analysed and interpreted
  - f. Finalize the evaluation report, incorporating comments and questions from the feedback/ audit trail. Record own feedback in the audit trail including those of the members of the team, the evaluation manager, the commissioning programme unit and key stakeholders.
- 4. Project manager:
  - Provide inputs/ advice to the evaluation manager and evaluation reference group on the detail and scope of the TOR for the evaluation and how the findings will be used
  - b. Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations
  - c. Provide the evaluation manager with all required data (e.g. relevant monitoring data) and documentation (reports, minutes, reviews, studies, etc.), contacts/ stakeholder list etc.
  - d. Ensure that data and documentation in general, but in particular related to gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, are made available to the evaluation manager
  - e. Provide comments and clarification on the TOR, inception report and draft evaluation reports
  - f. Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP
  - g. Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to all the stakeholders including the project board
  - h. Implement relevant key actions on evaluation recommendations

#### 9. Time frame for the evaluation process

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which the evaluator will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office (e.g. workplan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report).

- Desk review.
- Briefings of evaluator.
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report.
- In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires).
- Preparing the draft report.
- Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance).
- Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report.

In addition, the evaluator may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge sharing and dissemination.

#### Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome evaluation)

ΑCΤΙVΙΤΥ	ESTIMATED # OF 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 contract signing 3 October 2021	UNDP or remote	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluator	-	At the time of contract signing 3 -10 October 2021	Via email	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within two weeks of contract signing 10 -15 October 2021	Home- based	Evaluator
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Within two weeks of contract signing 3-18 October 2021		Evaluator
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report 19 – 26 October 2021	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews, and focus groups	5 days	Within four weeks of contract signing 26 - 31 October 2021	In country With field visits	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day	1 November 2021	In country	Evaluator
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (4-5 pages)	6 days	Within three weeks of the completion of the field mission 2 -8 November	Home- based	Evaluator
Draft report submission	-			Evaluator
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report 15 November 2021	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments 16 November	Remotely UNDP	UNDP, stakeholder, and evaluator
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	2 days	Within one week of final debriefing 23 – 30 November 2021	Home- based	Evaluator
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50	-	Within one week of final debriefing	Home- based	Evaluator
pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)		7 -15 December 2021		
Estimated total days for the evaluation	20			

#### 10. Application submission process and criteria for selection

As required by the procurement unit.

#### 11. TOR annexes

Annexes can be used to provide additional detail about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators. Some examples include:

- Documents to be consulted. A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and inception report. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
  - Relevant national strategy documents.
  - Strategic and other planning documents (e.g., programme and project documents).
  - Monitoring plans and indicators.
  - o UNDP evaluation policy, UNEG norms and standards and other policy documents.
- Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection and analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated. Table 5 provides a sample evaluation matrix template.

#### Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub- questions	Data sources	Data collection methods/ tools	Indicators/ success standards	Methods for data analysis

 Schedule of tasks, milestones, and deliverables. Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.

- **Required format for the evaluation report.** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the template for evaluation reports (see annex 4 below).
- Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details (annex 3)
- Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation. UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system'.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866#:~:text=The%20UNEG%20Ethical%20Guidelines%20for%20Evaluation%2 Owere%20first%20published%20in%202008.&text=This%20document%20aims%20to%20support,day%20to%20day%20evaluati on%20practice.

UNDP Evaluation Guidelines June 2021 update

## UNDP Evaluation: complaints and dispute settlement, and reporting wrongdoing process

#### **Complaints and dispute settlement**

Should you or a member of the evaluation team have material concerns about the implementation of an evaluation or finalisation of an evaluation report, you are freely able to raise your concerns with the management within UNDP. You may submit your concerns anonymously at any stage of the evaluation process, including after an evaluation's completion, though UNDP encourages prompt reporting to ensure issues can be addressed in a timely manner.

For example, you may decide to alert UNDP management if:

- You feel unduly pressured to change the findings, conclusions or/and recommendations of an evaluation you have been contracted to undertake
- Payment for the evaluation is being withheld until it is adjusted to accommodate the requests of the evaluation commissioner (other than to address quality concerns in relation to the report)
- You have not been provided with information that you consider to be material to the evaluation report
- The scope or depth of the evaluation has been adversely affected because you have not been provided with adequate access to interview or make connections with stakeholders

Please raise any material concerns with the Deputy Director of the relevant Regional Bureau who will ensure a timely response, and act fairly to address your concerns and seek to settle any disputes. Please also include the Independent Evaluation Office, in your correspondence (evaluation.office@undp.org).

#### **Reporting wrongdoing**

UNDP takes all reports of alleged wrongdoing seriously. In accordance with the <u>UNDP Legal Framework</u> for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct, the Office of Audit and Investigation (OAI) is the principal channel to receive allegations.<sup>1</sup>

Anyone with information regarding fraud, waste, abuse or other wrongdoing against UNDP programmes or involving UNDP staff is strongly encouraged to report this information through the Investigations Hotline (+1-844-595-5206).

People reporting wrongdoing to the Investigations Hotline have the option to leave relevant contact information or to remain anonymous. However, allegations of workplace harassment and abuse of authority cannot be reported anonymously.

When reporting to the Investigations Hotline, people are encouraged to be as specific as possible, including the basic details of who, what, where, when and how any of these incidents occurred. Specific information will allow OAI to properly investigate the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigations hotline, managed by an independent service provider on behalf of UNDP to protect confidentiality, can be directly accessed worldwide and free of charge in different ways:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://www.undp.org/accountability/audit/investigations

UNDP Evaluation Guidelines June 2021 update

**ONLINE REFERRAL FORM** (You will be redirected to an independent third-party site.)

**PHONE - REVERSED CHARGES** <u>Click here for worldwide numbers</u> (interpreters available 24 hours/day) Call +1-844-595-5206 in the USA

EMAIL directly to OAI at: reportmisconduct@undp.org

#### **REGULAR MAIL**

Deputy Director (Investigations) Office of Audit and Investigations United Nations Development Programme One UN Plaza, DC1, 4th Floor New York, NY 10017 USA

### **Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix and Data Collection Instruments**

#### RELEVANCE

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
WAS THE PROJECT DESIGN ADEQUATE?				
How relevant was the project to the national development priorities, country program outputs and outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs?	Project Document. National and sector strategies and assessments. UNDP Strategic Plan and Umbrella Program.	Documents review.	Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives, national priorities, UNDP country program objectives, and the SDGs.	Assessment for coherence with policies, strategies, and plans.
To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the country program outcome?	Project Document. UNDP Strategic Plan and Umbrella Program. Country Reviews.	Documents review.	Consistency between the project log frame and country theory of change.	Assessment of project goals, activities, and expected results.
Were risks and assumptions adequately identified and addressed in the project design?	Project Document.	Document review.	Project assumptions and risks are logical and robust.	Analysis of project assumptions and project risks.
Were gender equality and the empowerment of women addressed in the project design?	Projects document. Assessments on gender issues in Saudi Arabia.	Documents review.	Evidence of a project effort to ensure equal and active participation of women in the activities.	Search for evidence for gender mainstreaming in the project design.

#### COHERENCE

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
WAS THE PROJECT DESIGN ADEQUATE?				
How well does the project fit with other projects in the country?	Project Document. National and sector programs and reviews.	Documents review.	Consistency with other interventions in the country.	Assessment of compatibility with other interventions in the country.
Have overlaps with other projects been avoided and synergies established?	National and sector programs and reviews.	Documents review.	Evidence for lack of overlaps and synergies with other projects.	Assessment for overlaps and synergies with other projects.
To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the design?	National and sector program/project evaluations and reports.	Documents review.	Evidence of implemented lessons learned.	Assessment for implementation of lessons learned.

#### EFFECTIVENESS

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
HAS THE PROJECT DELIVERED THE EXPECTED OUTPUTS,	HAS THE PROJECT DELIVERED THE EXPECTED OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES, AND IMPACTS?			
What is the level of achievement of each of the main indicators/targets set in the results framework: (1) establishment and operationalization of the NCGD/GIC; (2) development of capacities for efficient delivery of survey services; (3) improving and promoting the quality of geospatial services and products; (4) achievement of wider visibility of GASGI; (5) achievement of financial sustainability of GASGI and contribution to the national economy?				

Establishment and operationalization of the NCGD/GIC				
<ul> <li>Is the NCGD/GIC structured and operationalized to meet the target objectives?<sup>10</sup></li> <li>Is the Center properly designed to expand the marketing and broaden public awareness about the GASGI products and services?</li> <li>Is the Center's organizational structure defined with clear job descriptions, a chain of command, and reporting lines?</li> <li>How many staff has been employed during the project implementation?</li> <li>Is the number of staff adequate to meet the workload requirements?</li> <li>Does staff have the necessary background and experience to perform the work of their position?</li> <li>What is the percentage of women recruited compared to men, and to what position?</li> </ul>	NCGD/GIC organization chart. NCGD/GIC technical, financial, monitoring, and evaluation reports. NCGD/GIC management. National Project Manager. GASGI focus group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	High level of NCGD/GIC's organizational effectiveness.	Assessment of organizational structure and performance.
<ul> <li>Is the geospatial database designed and populated?<sup>11</sup></li> <li>How many data models have been developed and tested?</li> <li>Is the database designed to support all business and data creation functions of GASGI?</li> <li>To what extent has the database been populated with test and real data?</li> <li>What is the current database functionality?</li> <li>To what extent has the established geospatial database contributed to the improvement of</li> </ul>	GSC/GASGI evaluation reports on the geospatial database. NCGD/GIC management and technical staff. GASGI Focus Group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Database design meets all organization and user needs.	Assessment of technical feasibility and viability.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Related to Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized, Indicator: 1.1 NCGD/GIC structured and implemented.
 <sup>11</sup> Related to Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized, Indicators: 1.2 Geospatial database designed and populated and 1.4 Models of data simulation developed.

GASGI product generation and service delivery?				
<ul> <li>How effective were the project activities in strengthening the capacity of NCGD/GIC staff?<sup>12</sup></li> <li>Has staff been provided with proper training to perform their duties?</li> <li>How do they apply the knowledge gained from the training?</li> <li>To what extent have women and persons with disabilities been involved in the capacity building?</li> </ul>	Training package of survey specialties: law of the sea, land survey, geodetic survey, topographic survey, and cadastral survey. Reports from training workshops. NCGD/GIC management and technical staff. GASGI Focus Group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Evidence that the trainees increased their knowledge and understanding. Degree of satisfaction of NCGD/GIC staff with the provided services.	Assessment of training curricula and results.
<ul> <li>What was the objective, and which activities have been included in the technical preparation for implementing the NGRF?<sup>13</sup></li> <li>What documents and deliverables have been produced during the project?</li> <li>Which capacity building and awareness initiatives have been undertaken?</li> </ul>	GASGI report for the preparation for implementing the NGRF. GASGI management and technical staff.	Documents review. Interviews,	Evidence of appropriateness and completeness of activities.	Assessment of scope and feasibility.
Development of capacities for efficient delivery of survey services.				
To what extent did the project contribute to improvement in capacities in the core areas of land survey, geodetic survey, topographic survey, and hydrographical survey? <sup>14</sup>	Training package of survey specialties: law of the sea, land survey, geodetic survey,	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Evidence that the trainees increased their knowledge and understanding. Degree of satisfaction with the provided services.	Assessment training curricula and results.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Related to Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized, Indicator: 1.3 Number of staff recruited and trained for the NCGD/GIC.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Related to Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized, Indicator: 1.6 Technical preparation for the implementation of the NGRF completed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Related to Output 2: Capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services, Indicators: 2.1 Comprehensive training package formulated on survey specialities: law of the sea; land survey; geodetic survey; and cadastral survey and 2.2 Five workshops convened for extensive training on hydrographical survey and oceanographic science, 2.3 Six workshops conducted on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sectors' institutions and 2.4 Four training workshops conducted on land survey, geodetic survey; topographic survey and hydrographical survey.

<ul> <li>Has a training package of survey specialties: law of the sea, land survey, geodetic survey, topographic survey, and cadastral survey been developed?</li> <li>How many trainings and in which fields have been organized?</li> <li>Have professionals outside GASGI been involved? How many and from which institutions?</li> <li>To what extent have women and persons with disabilities been involved in the training?</li> <li>Have trainees been provided with relevant and effective training for their job?</li> <li>How do trainees apply what they have learned in training?</li> </ul>	topographic survey, and cadastral survey. Reports from training workshops. GASGI management and technical staff. GASGI focus group. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group.		Level of involvement of interested professionals in the training activities.	
Improving and promoting the quality of geospatial services and products?				
<ul> <li>To what extent has the project contributed to improving the quality of geospatial services and products?<sup>15</sup></li> <li>Has a scoping of the geospatial market size and feasibility of geospatial products and services been undertaken, and what are the results?</li> <li>Has a marketing strategy been formulated, and what are the main elements?</li> <li>Have sector-related studies for marketing strategy implementation been conducted, and what are the results?</li> </ul>	Project reports. Marketing strategy. Sector-based studies. Transformation plan. Action plans. Business plans. Transformation plan. Financial reports. GASGI management and technical staff.	Documents review. Interviews.	Evidence of positive changes in quality and service delivery.	Analysis of performance and financial results.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Related to Output 3: Quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted (added after the Substantive Project Revision of March 3, 2021).

<ul> <li>Has annual planning for implementation of the marketing strategy been applied? What are the key components?</li> <li>How effective has been the developed marketing strategy?</li> <li>Has a plan for transforming GASGI to implement the new mandate been developed? What are the changes and new priorities?</li> <li>Has a plan for attracting business investment been developed? What are the objectives, attraction strategies, and tactics?</li> <li>How many and which international events related to excellence in geospatial performance have been attended? How do attendees apply what they have learned?</li> </ul>				
Achievement of wider visibility of GASGI.				
<ul> <li>To what extent has the project contributed to the wider visibility of GASGI?<sup>16</sup></li> <li>Has a public awareness program been formulated and implemented?</li> <li>How many communication messages have been delivered?</li> <li>How have stakeholders accepted the public awareness program?</li> </ul>	Public awareness program. Communication messages. Monitoring reports. GASGI management and technical staff. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Improved business activity indicators.	Analysis of business results.
Achievement of financial sustainability of GASGI and contribution to the national economy.				
To what extent did the project contribute to the achievement of GASGI financial sustainability and input to the national economy? <sup>17</sup>	Financial reports. GASGI management.	Documents review. Interviews.	Improved financial sustainability and performance indicators.	Analysis of sustainability indicators.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Related to Output 4: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS.
 <sup>17</sup> Related to Output 3: Advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy.

•	To what extent has the project improved the performance of GCS/GASGI. <sup>18</sup> Does GCS/GASGI perceive itself as better positioned and skilled to cover its role and perform its duties?	GASGI management and technical staff. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	High level of approval from stakeholders.	Analysis of performance results.
٠	To what extent do other government institutions and private businesses perceive this?				

#### EFFICIENCY

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis	
HOW EFFICIENTLY WAS THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTED?					
To what extent was the project management structure outlined in the PD efficient in generating the expected results?	Project document. Project quality assurance reports. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interview.	Extent to which the management structure facilitated the project implementation.	Analysis of management experience and problems.	
<ul> <li>Has a system of focal points from stakeholders been established and involved in the project management and implementation?</li> <li>Is this contributed towards the achievement of the project objectives?</li> </ul>	National Project Manager. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group.	Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Level and extent of stakeholder involvement.	Analysis of stakeholder involvement and impact on the project.	
<ul> <li>To what extent have the UNDP project</li> <li>implementation strategy and execution been efficient</li> <li>and cost-effective?</li> <li>Have resources been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?</li> </ul>	Project reports. Financial reports. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interviews.	Evidence that the most feasible and economic alternatives have been identified to reach the project objectives.	Analysis of efficiency and cost- effectiveness.	
<ul> <li>To what extent have resources been used efficiently?</li> </ul>	Financial reports. Financial monitoring reports.	Documents review.	Level of expenditure, against the level of achievement	Analysis of results and resources framework.	

<sup>18</sup> Related to Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized, Indicator: 1.3 Number of staff recruited and trained for the NCGD/GIC.

	Minutes of meeting of Project Board.		across the project components.	
<ul> <li>Have there been regular reviews of the project work to track progress to inform corrections and adjustments?</li> </ul>	Project reports. Project quality assurance reports. Minutes of Meeting of Project Board.	Documents review.	Evidence of regular reviews and corrective measures to improve performance.	Assessment of the project performance.
<ul> <li>To what extent have project activities been delivered on time?</li> </ul>	Project reports.	Documents review.	Planned versus actual work plan.	Assessment for delays in project deliveries.
<ul> <li>Were risks adequately identified and managed during the project implementation?</li> </ul>	Project Document. Project reports. Project quality assurance reports and risk logs	Documents review.	Level to which risks are managed effectively.	Analysis of project risk management.
<ul> <li>To what extent did the M&amp;E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?</li> <li>Was the project's M&amp;E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?</li> <li>Were baseline conditions, methodology, and roles and responsibilities well-defined in the Project Document?</li> <li>Were progress data against indicators regularly reported according to the frequency stated in the Monitoring Plan?</li> <li>Were the progress and performance?</li> </ul>	Project Document. Project reports. Project quality assurance reports. Minutes of Meeting of Project Board.	Documents review.	Evidence that the M&E system fulfilled both accountability and learning requirements.	Analysis of the M&E system during the project implementation.

#### SUSTAINABILITY

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
HOW SUSTAINABLE ARE THE PROJECT RESULTS?				
Does the project have a sustainability plan, and how often has it been reviewed?	Project document. Project quality assurance reports.	Documents review.	A sustainability plan exists and is adequate for the project.	Assessment of sustainability measures.
<ul> <li>To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?</li> <li>Has the NCGD/GIC been prepared to carry out the activities after the project completion?</li> <li>What financial arrangements have been made?</li> </ul>	GASGI and NCGD/GIC management. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interviews.	Likelihood that adequate financial resources will be available prepared and agreed upon under the project.	Analysis of financial arrangements and sustainability indicators.
Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?	GASGI management. National Project Manager.	Interviews.	Lack of legal risk and governance uncertainty.	Analysis of legal risk and governance uncertainty.
To what extent are lessons learned documented by the project team on a continual basis and used to inform management decisions?	Project quality assurance and lessons learned reports. Minutes of Meeting of Project Board	Documents review.	Evidence that lessons learned are documented and used to inform decisions.	Analysis of completeness of documentation and management decisions.
Does GASGI see that it is in their interest to continue the project benefits?	GASGI management. National Project Manager.	Interviews.	Degree to which GASGI assumed responsibility for the project and provided adequate support to project execution.	Examination of the institutional capacities needed to sustain the project outcomes/benefits.

### Questions on Lessons Learned for Preparing a New Project Supporting GASGI

#### RELEVANCE

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
WHAT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO UPGRADE THE PROJECT I	RELEVANCE?			
Have there been significant changes in the context that may affect the future project design and implementation?	Geospatial sector review documents. National Project Manager. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Significant changes occurred in the context within which the project operates.	Analysis of geospatial sector situation.
What priority needs should still be addressed in the country's geospatial sector?	Project work plan. Geospatial sector review documents. National Project Manager. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Priority changes occurred or are expected to take place.	Analysis of geospatial sector situation and perspectives.
Is there potential to scale up the project in the future to better contribute to the national development priorities and country program outputs and outcomes?	GASGI management. National Project Manager.	Interviews.		Analysis of the management vision and goals.

#### EFFECTIVENESS

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis
WHAT FACTORS CONTRIBUTED TO THE PROJECT EFFECT	TIVENESS OR INEFFECTIVENE	SS?		
Were the project objectives and outputs feasible within its frame?	Project Document. Project reports.	Documents review. Interview.	Extent to which the project has achieved its main objectives.	Analysis of project design and results.

	National Project Manager.			
Was the project work plan appropriate to address identified capacity needs and goals?	Project work plan. Geospatial sector review documents. National Project Manager. Stakeholders. Stakeholder focus group. GASGI focus group.	Documents review. Interviews. Focus group discussions. Questionnaires.	Evidence of alignment with the capacity needs.	Review of work plan against identified capacity needs and priorities.
What factors contributed to the project's effectiveness or ineffectiveness?	Project reports. Project quality assurance reports. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interviews.	Contributing factors identified.	Review of project effectiveness.
<ul> <li>In which areas does the project have the most significant achievements?</li> <li>Why and what have been the supporting factors?</li> <li>How can the project build on or expand these achievements?</li> </ul>	Project reports. GASGI management. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interviews.	Degree to which various project activities contributed to the project outcomes and objectives.	Analysis of project performance.
<ul> <li>In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements?</li> <li>What have been the constraining factors and why?</li> <li>How can or could they be overcome?</li> </ul>	Project reports. GASGI management. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interviews.	Degree to which various project activities contributed to the project outcomes and objectives.	Analysis of project performance.
What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?	Project reports. GASGI management. National Project Manager.	Documents review. Interviews.	Degree of success in achieving expected outcomes and benefits.	Analysis of alternatives.

# **Annex 3: List of Individuals Interviewed**

Name of participant	Position/ Institution
Dr. Mohammed Yahya Alsaye	President GASGI
Mr. Ali Alshahrani	Advisor to GASGI President
Eng. Basem Alshafi	Advisor to GASGI President, General Supervisor of Organizational Excellence
Eng. Faisal Alzahrani	Assistant Director General, Hydrography Department
Mr. Ian Martin	Advisor under the UNDP program, Hydrography Department
Eng. Sultan Alshahrani	Assistant Director General, Geodesy Department
Dr. Rossen Grebenitcharsky	Advisor under the UNDP program, Geodesy Department
Eng. Majdi Alharbi	Manager of Geographic Names, Map Production Department
Mr. Siyaf Khan	Advisor under the UNDP program, Map Production Department
Eng. Bader Alharbi	Assistant Director General, Geospatial Information Center, National Project Manager
Eng. Mohammed Almabrook	Manager of Business Services, Geospatial Information Center
Eng. Husam Alharbi	Survey Engineer, Geospatial Data Governance, Geospatial Information Center
Eng. Abdulrahman Kenanah	Project Management Officer, Geospatial Data Governance, Geospatial Information Center
Eng. Turki	GIS Engineer, Geospatial Data Governance, Geospatial Information Center

### **Annex 4: Interview Questions**

### **GASGI** Management

How relevant is the project to the national development priorities?

How well does the project respond to the needs in the geospatial sector?

What is the synergy with other projects?

How do you evaluate the level of achievement of the main target indicators set in the RRF: (1) establishment and operationalization of the NCGD/GIC; (2) development of capacities for efficient delivery of survey services; (3) improving and promoting the quality of geospatial services and products; (4) achievement of wider visibility of GASGI; (5) achievement of financial sustainability of GASGI and contribution to the national economy?

In which areas did the project have the greatest and fewest achievements?

To what extent did the project improve the performance of GASGI?

To what extent did the project contribute to the wider visibility of GASGI?

Do you see that it is in GASGI's interest to continue and possibly expand the project?

To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain and continue the project?

### **Common Questions to Representatives of GASGI** Departments

What was your department's involvement in the project? What were the deliverables? What was the level of achievement of each deliverable?

What do you consider to be the project's main achievements?

What was the level of collaboration with stakeholders in the sector?

How many staff from your department was involved in training under the project? What was the percentage of women? What was the training program? How do you evaluate the training's relevancy and effectiveness? How do trainees apply what they have learned in training? What are your department's geospatial skills needs and gaps, and how can these be most effectively addressed?

Please comment on the project's relevance, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Were gender equity, disability, and social inclusion issues adequately considered? What else should be included to improve the project?

How do you evaluate the level of communication with PIU and USAID CO?

### Hydrography Department

How many of the five planned workshops for extensive hydrographical survey and oceanographic training were carried? What was the training program? How do you evaluate the training's relevancy and effectiveness?

Did you participate in public awareness campaigns, and what was your contribution?

### **Geodesy Department**

What was the objective, and which activities have been included in the technical preparation for implementing the NGRF? What documents and deliverables have been produced? Which capacity building and awareness initiatives have been undertaken?

Was a training package of survey specialties: law of the sea, land survey, geodetic survey, topographic survey, and cadastral survey developed, and what was the content? How many trainings and in which fields were organized? Were professionals outside GASGI involved? How many and from which institutions?

### **Geospatial Information Center**

Was the NCGD/GIC structured and operationalized to meet the target objectives? How many staff was employed during the project implementation? What was the percentage of women recruited compared to men, and to what position? Is the number adequate to meet the workload requirements?

Is the geospatial database designed? How many data models were developed and tested? Which percent of the database was populated? Which business functions were supported? Do the database support services that GASGI is intended to provide to external users? Is the database assessable to external users?

How effective were the project activities in strengthening the capacity of NCGD/GIC staff? How many staff was involved in training designed specifically for NCGD/GIC? What was the percentage of women? What was the training program? What were the training's relevance and effectiveness? How do trainees apply the knowledge gained from the training?

Were the following outputs related to the improvement of the quality of geospatial services and products delivered and what was their content: (1) Assessment for the potential contribution of GCS to the national economy; (2) Action plan towards financial sustainability; (3) Scope of the geospatial market size and the feasibility of geospatial products and services; (4) National marketing strategy; (5) Studies for implementation of the marketing strategy; (5) Annual plan for implementation of the marketing strategy; (6) Plan for transforming GASGI to implement the new mandate; (7) Plan for attracting business investment?

### PIU

How many staff does the PIU have, and what are their functions? How do you control the project's budgetary execution? How do you evaluate the level of communication with USAID CO and the technical staff?

What is the level of achievement of each of the target indicators set in the RRF: (1) establishment and operationalization of the NCGD/GIC; (2) development of capacities for efficient delivery of survey services; (3) improving and promoting the quality of geospatial services and products; (4) achievement of wider visibility of GASGI; (5) achievement of financial sustainability of GASGI and contribution to the national economy?

How many of the planned: five workshops for extensive training on hydrographical survey, and oceanographic science; six workshops on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sectors' institutions; and four training workshops conducted on land survey, geodetic survey; topographic survey and hydrographical survey were conducted and what was the content? How many participants from GASGI and institutions outside the Authority were included? What was the percent women?

Was a system of focal points from stakeholders established and involved in the project training and capacity-building activities? Did this contribute towards the achievement of the project objectives?

Was a public awareness program to increase the GASGI visibility formulated and implemented? How many public awareness campaigns and communication messages were delivered?

How do you evaluate the project relevance, coherence, and effectiveness? Were the project objectives and outputs feasible within its frame? To what extent was the project management structure outlined in the PD efficient in generating the expected results? Did the project adequately consider gender equity, disability, and social inclusion issues? What are your recommendations for a future project?

In which areas does the project have the greatest and fewest achievements?

To what extent were the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution efficient? How do you evaluate the level of communication and collaboration with UNDP? What factors contributed to the project's effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Is there potential to scale up the project in the future to better contribute to the national development priorities?

# **Annex 5: Survey Questionnaire**

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### project "Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey"

This project (2018-2021) was a strategic partnership between the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information (GASGI) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), aimed at strengthening and promoting the survey and geospatial Information sector and seeking to create partnerships to market the various survey products produced by the Authority. The project's objective was expected to be achieved through five Outputs:

- Output 1: NCGD/GIC established and operationalized.
- Output 2: National capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services.
- Output 3: Advisory services provided towards the achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy.
- Output 4: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS.
- The Substantive Project and Budget Revision of 2021 (see above) added a new Output:
- Output 5: Enhance the quality of the geospatial services and products.

Institution and department	
Name and position	

Did you participate in training workshops under the project?	
What was the workshop for?	
How do you evaluate the training's relevancy and effectiveness?	
Do you apply the knowledge gained from the training?	

Were you involved in consultations related to the project? such as training program, geospatial data standards, ownership, accuracy, etc	
What was the topic?	

Do you use geospatial products or services from GASGI?	
What kind of product or service?	
How do you estimate the quality and visibility?	
Do you face challenges, and how could these be addressed?	

Г

Date	
------	--

### **Annex 6: Project Document**

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

#### PROJECT DOCUMENT Saudi Arabia



Project Title: Support to the General Commission for Survey Project Number: SAU10- 110186 Implementing Partner: General Commission for Survey Start Date: 1 May 2018 End Date: 30 April 2020 PAC

PAC Meeting date: 24 April 2018

#### **Brief Description**

This project represents the second phase in a strategic partnership focusing on promotion of the surveying works and the myriad products of surveying. The key objective of this intervention is to maintain provision of advisory services in developing the national capacities for effective geo-spatial surveys, generating multi-purpose knowledge from such surveys to efficiently boost national efforts in achieving the key directions of the Saudi Vision 2030 as well as promoting the national implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The completion of the previous phase has been instrumental in nurturing the idea of developing the foundation of financial sustainability whereby the General Commission of Survey (GCS) will achieve a high level of efficiency in all its hydrological and geospatial products. It is through this quality and efficiency that the GCS wishes to expand marketing of its products and to broaden the public awareness about its products and services. The core around which all aspects of this project revolve is the design and operationalizing of a National Centre for Geospatial Data.

On this basis, the project has four interconnected outputs:

- 1) National Centre for Geospatial Data strengthened and operationalized
- 2) National capacities developed
- Advisory services provided towards achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy
- 4) Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS

Capacity development will also focus on training in the core areas of land survey; geodetic survey; topographic survey' and hydrological survey.

Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD or GPD):	Total resources required:		
Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure	Total resources allocated:		
		UNDP TRAC:	
		Donor:	
Indicative Output(s): National Policies developed to promote economic diversification with increased employment of		Government:	\$800,000
		In-Kind:	
	Unfunded:		

Agreed by (signatures)1:

Government	UNDP
Name: H. E. Dr Abdulaziz Ibrahim Al-Saab, President, the General Commission for Survey Signature:	Name: Mr. Firas Gharaibeh UNDP Resident Representative, a.i. Signature:
Date:	Date: 14 May 2018
# I. DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGE

Saudi Arabia is among the high achievers of human development. Linking development to a longterm vision of the economy toward the year 2030, Saudi Arabia is in fact seeking to achieve a diversified, prosperous, private-sector-driven economy that would provide rewarding job opportunities, quality education, health care and necessary skills to ensure the well-being of all citizens. Along this path, the Kingdom has achieved and sustained great gains with respect to its progress in the global Human Development Index (HDI) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), by persistently ascending to the status of Very High Development category in 2016 from that of middle-income ranking in the 1990s.

Based on the three pillars of the Kingdom vision 2030, launched on 25 April 2016, the significance of the geographical information has been accentuated. Such information is considered as the means for expanding the scope of electronic services provided to other services such as (GIS). In this basis, the General Commission for Survey has studied and analysed its current status and the situation of Survey and geospatial information in the Kingdom, GCS has worked to develop the survey and geospatial information sector to be one of the national income resources according to the best international practices for achieving one of the most important objectives of vision 2030 to find other sources of income and not to reduce Saudi Arabia's dependence on oil as a major source. The GCS's vision, which was approved by the Board of Directors (and pending for the approval of the Council of Ministers), included the creation of investment opportunities in this field. In this regards GCS recruited specialized international experts for studying the best practices in the world (Norway, People's Republic of China, South Korea, Abu Dhabi) to adopt the best applications and programs to achieve the GCS's vision to strengthen the economy and rationalization of spending through its role as the central authority for the management and operation of the National Centre for GIS and the legislative and monitoring the survey and geospatial information sector to promote and unify the performance standards and means of measurement and control, to achieve a significant reduction of costs spending as a result of the implementation of similar projects by other sectors, as well as establishing their geospatial information centres to achieve their own requirements only, as well as opportunities to invest in geographic information due to the unification of the centre from which all the other sector can obtain the information and data.

## II. STRATEGY

This project intends to utilize the strong capabilities of UNDP in capacity development and to forge partnership between the GCS and UNDP to enhance the national capacities for generation, compilation, processing and efficient usage of the geo-data and geographical information systems in Saudi Arabia. It is envisaged that the project provides the Government, represented by GCS, with the platform to tap international best practices in terms of survey methods, geospatial variables and relevant expertise.

The project foresees the following four outputs as follows:

- 5) National Centre for Geospatial Data established and operationalized
- 6) National capacities developed
- 7) Advisory services provided towards achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy
- 8) Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility of GCS

This project has been preceded by a capacity development UNDP-supported intervention that was culminated in delivering extensive training packages in the key disciplines of relevance to the GCS.

The matrix of these outputs will be solidly based on three cross-cutting urgencies: contribution of the sector to the national economy through well-defined niches; advocacy and public awareness about the survey products and their significance for the evidence-based decision-making in all sectors; and realization of the financial sustainability through targeted marketing of the GCS products to a wider audience.

The achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) at the national level will be greatly boosted through the emphasis placed by this project on the urgency to expand evidencebased decision-making at all sectors of the economy. It is within this framework that the geospatial centre will enrich the short- to medium-term planning and decision-making along with a strong tendency towards globalization. Such tendency will also promote the competitiveness of the local economy.

In line with the above narrative, the theory of change is depicted as follows:



### **RESULTS AND PARTNERSHIPS**

### **Expected Results**

The end-result of this intervention is to develop the national capacities of the Government in coming up with high quality geospatial products. The first step towards this end-result will be the creation of the necessary institutional arrangements, including the establishment of the National Centre for Geospatial Data. The next two steps, which will be taken simultaneously, are the capacity development programme and the partnerships with the best practices around the world. The capacity development programme will commence with a set of training modules to build the strategic, leadership and technical competencies of the GCS in the various disciplines relevant to surveying, geospatial data processing, presentation and

marketing. Public awareness will certainly be targeted to promote visibility of the GCS among the private sector and the civil society.

### **Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results**

• This intervention shall deploy both long-term advisors and short-term consultants in the various units within GCS. Capacity development is viewed from its three layers, with particular emphasis on the enabling environment to capture synergies of coordination across sectors and regions.

### Partnerships

• The National Centre for Geospatial Data will identify national and sub-national modus operandi and lists of partners to assist in achieving the intended results. The institutional structure of the national center will be informed by the best practices to be brought from at least three countries of the South.

### **Risks and Assumptions**

- The key risks that might thwart efficient delivery of the intended results include the following, along with their proposed mitigation factors (detailed risk analysis is in Annex II):
- Difficulty in smooth coordination across sectors and regions: There is a potential risk of encountering such a difficulty; however, the project's components of capacity development and the public awareness will mitigate this risk. It is well recognized that the present intervention entails a genuine change in the development paradigm through enrichment of evidence-based decision-making and through elevating the value of geospatial planning.
- Delays might be encountered in recruiting long-term and short-term top-notch advisors with bilingual competency (Arabic and English). While the urgency of this bilingual competency is quite noticeable in working at the regional level, yet the project will establish a translation supporting team for immediate deployment.

### Stakeholder Engagement

• This intervention is grounded in a host of national and international partnerships. As the overall impact of the intervention is projected to reach all population of Saudi Arabia and in terms of both the existing generation and the future ones, the public awareness campaigns will be designed to engage all citizens.

### South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC)

• The project will utilize north-south and south-south cooperation modalities in support of the intended outcome. South-South Cooperation arrangements will be reached jointly with at least three countries of best practices in the areas of land survey; geodetic survey; topographic survey' and hydrological survey.

### Knowledge

- The project intends to produce reports on all aspects of the GCS work for the national audience in the public and private sectors in addition to the Civil Society Organizations. In addition, the project conceives establishing a unified database.
- It is intended that the lessons learned and best practices will be captured for dissemination utilizing UNDP's worldwide presence and knowledge networking.

### Sustainability and Scaling Up

• This intervention is designed to ensured sustainability of development results over the longrun through the two tenets of capacity development; and promotion of national ownership. This will emphasize preference of national priorities involving both the Government, the private sector and the civil society.

### IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

### Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

• The selected strategy of the intervention will deliver maximum results within the available funds as system-wide coordination is anticipated to reduce costs at downstream level with numerous synergies across sectors.

### **Project Management**

- This is project will be administered from the Head office of the General Commission for Survey in addition to the UNDP's Implementation Support Services to be provided from the UN Premises. However, the success of the National Centre for Geospatial Data relies on well-functioning system of focal points from all stakeholders. A detailed focal point mechanism will be developed for this purpose. The focal persons from all sectors will be trained on methods of updating geospatial data on a timely basis, improvement of data quality and enhancement of accuracy.
- Direct Project Costing (DPC) of 4% will be applied in addition to the General Management Service of 3%.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT	DATA	BASELINE		Target by Year		Data Collection Method	
	INDICATORS	SOURCE	Value	Year	Year 1	Year 2	and Risks	
Output 1 The National Centre for Geospatial Data strengthened and operationalized to contribute to national economy	<b>1.1</b> The National Centre for Geospatial Data structured and implemented	GCS	0	2017	1		Government reporting	
Baseline: GIS Database in place	<b>1.2</b> Geospatial database designed and populated	GCS	0	2017	1		GCS evaluation report	
Indicators: Simulation models tested in relevant sectors	1.3 Number of staff recruited and trained for the National Centre for Geospatial Data	GCS	0	2017	15	20	Government reporting	
	<b>1.4</b> Models of data simulation developed	GCS	0	2017	200	50	GCS reporting	
Output 2: Capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services Baseline:	2.1 Five workshops convened for extensive training on hydrological survey, and oceanographic science	GCS	0	2017	3	2	Workshop reports	
Saudi Vision 2030 urging for efficiency of Government services Indicators: Number of 45 senior officials trained on various disciplines of GCS.	2.2 Six workshops conducted on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sectors' institutions	GCS	0	2017	3	3	Workshop reports	
	2.3 Four training workshops conducted on 1) land survey; 2) geodetic survey; 3) topographic survey and 4) Hydrological survey	GCS	0	2017	2	2	Workshop reports	

Farman			12			2	
Output 3: Advisory services towards achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the	<b>3.1</b> Desk review of best practices in financial sustainability	GCS	0	2017	1	2	
national economy	3.2 Study conducted on marketing of the geospatial data products	GCS	0	2017	1	0	
	3.3 Assessment done for potential contribution of the GCS to the national economy	GCS	1	2016	1	1	
	<b>3.4</b> Action plans formulated towards financial sustainability	GCŞ	0	2018	3		
Output 4: Advocacy promoted for a wider visibility	<b>4.1</b> Public awareness programme formulated and implemented	GCS	1	2015	1		
	<b>4.2</b> Communication messages developed and delivered	GCS	1	2017	9	3	

# V. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

# **Monitoring Plan**

Monitoring Activity	Purpose	Frequency	Expected Action	Partners (if joint)	Cost (if any)
Track results progress	Progress data against the results indicators in the RRF will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs.	Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator.	Slower than expected progress will be addressed by project management.		
Monitor and Manage Risk	Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy to manage financial risk.	Quarterly	Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken.		
Learn	Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project.	At least annually	Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions.		
Annual Project Quality Assurance	The quality of the project will be assessed against UNDP's quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the project.	Annually	Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed by project management and used to inform decisions to improve project performance.		
Review and Make Course Corrections	Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making.	At least annually	Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make course corrections.		
Project Report	A progress report will be presented to the Project Board and key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project	Annually, and at the end of the project (final report)			

	quality rating summary, an updated risk long with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period.			
Project Review (Project Board)	The project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board) will hold regular project reviews to assess the performance of the project and review the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project. In the project's final year, the Project Board shall hold an end-of project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to socialize project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences.	Specify frequency (i.e., at least annually)	Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project board and management actions agreed to address the issues identified.	

# VI. ANNUAL WORK PLAN (1 MAY 2018 - 30 APRIL 2019)

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Ta	rgets	Responsible	PL	ANNED BUDO	GET
		Y1	Y2	Party	Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
<b>Output 1:</b> The National Centre for Geospatial Data established	1.1Designing the structure the National Centre for Geospatial Data	1		GCS	00210		55,000
and operationalized	1.2 Formulating partnership strategy and mapping stakeholders	2		GCS	00210		35,000
	1.3 Implementing the structure and forging partnerships	1		GCS	00210		270,000
Output 2: Capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey	2.1Developing training manuals for hydrological survey and oceanographic science	1	1	GCS	00210		35,000
services	2.2 Organizing six workshops on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sectors' institutions	2	4	GCS	00210		135,000
	2.3 Organizing four training workshops conducted on 1) land survey; 2) geodetic survey; 3) topographic survey and 4) Hydrological survey	1	3	GCS	00210		85,000
Output 3: Advisory services towards	3.1 Conducting desk review of best practices in financial sustainability	1		UNDP	00210		15,000
achievement of financial sustainability and	3.2 Study conducted on marketing of the geospatial data products		1	GCS	00210		75,000
contribution to the national economy	3.3 Assessment done for potential contribution of the GCS to the national economy			GCS	00210		45,000

NIM Audit		UNDP	00210	10,000
General Management Support (3%)			00210	24000
Direct Project Costing (DPC) (2%)			00210	16,000
TOTAL				800,000

## Schedule of Payments Project: SAU10-110186 Advisory Services to GCS

Payments	Amount in US\$	Contributor
Payment upon signature	800,000	Government of Saudi Arabia
Total	800,000	

### VII. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

This project will be implemented under the National Implementation (NIM) modality with activities implemented through UNDP NIM modality, whereby GCS assumes implementation responsibility with UNDP Implementation Support Services for recruitment of international and national advisors and other activities as noted in the Annual Work Plan.

Activities under the project will be done through standard Project Board mechanism to serve as a steering body to ensure coherence of all activities under the project. UNDP will provide technical advisory support to all activities through the UNDP Country Office in Riyadh.

### **Project Board**

The Project Board is the group responsible for making consensual management decisions for a project when guidance is required by the National Project Manager, including recommendation for approval of project revisions. Project reviews by this group are made at biannual basis in Riyadh, or as necessary when raised by the National Project Manager. This group is consulted by the National Project Manager for decisions when management tolerances (i.e. constraints normally in terms of time and budget) have been exceeded. This group contains three roles: executive representing the project ownership to chair the group, senior Supplier role to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project, and senior Beneficiary role to ensure the realization of project benefits from the perspective of project beneficiaries.

The Project Board has the following members: the National Project Manager of the GCS (Executive and Senior Beneficiary), Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme, Saudi Arabia (as Senior Supplier). GCS and UNDP must always be present in the project board which works on a consensus basis and final decision making on project activities and accountability in accordance with its applicable regulations, rules, policies and procedures.

### **Project Assurance**

Project Assurance is the responsibility of each Project Board member, but the role can be delegated to staff within each agency. The Project Assurance role supports the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. The Team Leader for Governance UNDP Saudi Arabia will hold the Project Assurance role for the UNDP, and a similar level government representative would undertake this role for GCS. The National Project Manager and Project Assurance roles will never be held by the same individual in GCS.

### National Project Manager

The National Project Manager will be a senior official of GCS and shall have the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Project Board within the constraints laid down by the Project Board. The National Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making for the project. The National Project Manager's prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The National Project Manager is appointed by the GCS through letter to UNDP. GCS will also provide counterpart staff, offices facilities and necessary office equipment (including computers) for project staff, other project support facilities as required including for project related seminars, workshops and training facilities; other support in kind. The NPM shall prepare the AWP for each upcoming year for presentation to, and endorsement of, the Project Board Meeting. Terms of Reference/job descriptions for the respective long-term advisers and short term experts/consultants are set out in the Annex III.



### VIII. LEGAL CONTEXT AND RISK MANAGEMENT

### LEGAL CONTEXT STANDARD CLAUSES

This project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the SBAA between the Government of Saudi Arabia and UNDP, signed on 4 January 1976. Consistent with the Article III of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, the responsibility for the safety and security of the executing agency and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the executing agency's custody, rests with the executing agency. The executing agency shall: put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried; and assume all risks and liabilities related to the executing agency's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement. The executing agency agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via<u>http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm</u>.This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.

This project will be implemented by the General Commission for Survey ("Implementing Partner") in accordance with its financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of an Implementing Partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, the financial governance of UNDP shall apply.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT STANDARD CLAUSES**

#### Option a. Government Entity (NIM)

- Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA [or the Supplemental Provisions], the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the Implementing Partner's custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
  - a) Put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
  - b) Assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
- 2. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required

hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document [and the Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and the Implementing Partner]<sup>2</sup>.

- 3. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <a href="http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq">http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq</a> sanctions list.shtml. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under/further to this Project Document.
- 4. Consistent with UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (http://www.undp.org/secu-srm).
- 5. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.
- All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any
  programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental
  Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and
  documentation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Use bracketed text only when IP is an NGO/IGO

# IX. ANNEXES

- 1. Social and Environmental Screening Template, including additional Social and Environmental Assessments or Management Plans as relevant.
- 2. Risk Analysis.
- 3. TOR of the NPM
- 4. TORs of the key professional posts (to be elaborated upon work commencement)

### **ANNEX 2. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TEMPLATE**

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the <u>Social and Environmental Screening Procedure</u> and <u>Toolkit</u> for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.

### **Project Information**

PI	oject Information	
1.	Project Title	Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey
2.	Project Number	SAU10- 110186
3.	Location (Global/Region/Country)	Saudi Arabia

### Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

#### Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach

This project represents the second phase in a strategic partnership focusing on promotion of the surveying works and the myriad products of surveying. The key objective of this intervention is to maintain provision of advisory services in developing the national capacities for effective geo-spatial surveys, generating multi-purpose knowledge from such surveys to efficiently boost national efforts in achieving the key directions of the Saudi Vision 2030 as well as promoting the national implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

#### Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

The project's objectives do not differentiate between genders and serve population at large.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

This project will enhance and develop ways to environmental sustainability.

# Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the PotentialSocial and Environmental Risks?Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 - Risk Screening Checklist (based on any "Yes" responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note "No Risks Identified" and skip to Question 4 and Select "Low Risk". Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.	QUESTIC significan environm Note: Resp proceeding	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
Risk Description	Impact and Probabilit y (1-5)	Significan ce (Low, Moderate, High)	Comments		Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
Risk 1: Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups	I = P =	Low Low			The NSS has a component addressing equality of distribution of municipal services across all regions of Saudi Arabia
Risk 2 : none	= P =				
Risk 3:	= P =				
Risk 4:	l = P =				
[add additional rows as needed]					
	QUESTIO	N 4: What i	s the overall Project r	risk c	categorization?
	Se	elect one (see	SESP for guidance)		Comments
			Low Risk		Low

Moderate Risk	
High Risk	
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified and risk categorization, what requirem of the SES are relevant?	risks nents
Check all that apply	Comments
Principle 1: Human Rights	
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	° 🗆
1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management	
2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	
3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	10
4. Cultural Heritage	
5. Displacement and Resettlement	
6. Indigenous Peoples	
7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	This is the only relevant SES so far.

# Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor	1 May 2018	UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

# SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Che	cklist Potential Social and Environmental <u>Risks</u>	
Princ	iples 1: Human Rights	Answer (Yes/No )
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	NO
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? <sup>3</sup>	NO
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	NO
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	NO
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	NO
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	NO
7.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	NO
8.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	NO
Princ	iple 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	NO
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	NO
3.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	NO
4.	Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services?	NO
	For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being	
Princ encor	iple 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are npassed by the specific Standard-related questions below	
Stand	lard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	1.12
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?	NO
	For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes	
1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples	NO

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

	or local communities?			
1.3	.3 Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)			
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?			
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?			
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?			
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	NO		
1.8	8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?			
	For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction			
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	NO		
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	NO		
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area?	NO		
	For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.			
Stand	lard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation			
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant <sup>4</sup> greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	NO		
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	NO		
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)?	NO		
	For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding			
Stand	ard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions			
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	NO		
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	NO		
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	NO		
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	NO		
3.5	5 Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?			
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector- borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	NO		
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction,	NO		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> In regards to CO<sub>2</sub>, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

	operation, or decommissioning?				
3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	NO			
3.9	3.9 Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?				
Stand	dard 4: Cultural Heritage				
4.1	1 Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)				
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	NO			
Stand	dard 5: Displacement and Resettlement				
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	NO			
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	NO			
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? <sup>5</sup>	NO			
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	NO			
Stand	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples				
Stand	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	NO			
<b>Stand</b> 6.1 6.2	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	NO NO			
6.1         6.2           6.3         6.3	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?         If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.	NO NO NO			
Stand 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?         If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.         Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	NO NO NO			
Stand           6.1           6.2           6.3           6.4           6.5	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?         If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.         Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?         Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	NO NO NO NO NO			
Stance           6.1           6.2           6.3           6.4           6.5           6.6	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?         If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.         Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?         Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	NO NO NO NO NO NO			
Stance           6.1           6.2           6.3           6.4           6.5           6.6           6.7	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?         If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.         Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?         Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?         Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	NO NO NO NO NO NO			
Stance         6.1         6.2         6.3         6.3         6.4         6.5         6.6         6.7         6.8	dard 6: Indigenous Peoples         Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?         Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?         If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.         Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?         Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?         Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?         Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	NO NO NO NO NO NO NO			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

Stan	dard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	NO
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	NO
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?	NO
	For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol	
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	NO
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	NO

### Annex 2

### **RISK LOG**

Risk Institutional	Probability	Impact	Risk Response
Deficiencies of national capacities	Low	Moderate	GCS to seriously consider creating retention policies and incentives
High rate of turnover among professional posts	Moderate	High	Formulate career development paths through post-graduate scholarships

#### ANNEX 3

### Appendix A AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNDP AND THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES

- Reference is made to consultations between officials of the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") and officials of UNDP with respect to the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for nationally managed programmes and projects. UNDP and the Government hereby agree that the UNDP country office may provide such support services at the request of the Government through its institution designated in the relevant programme support document or project document, as described below.
- 2) The UNDP country office may provide support services for assistance with reporting requirements and direct payment. In providing such support services, the UNDP country office shall ensure that the capacity of the Government-designated institution is strengthened to enable it to carry out such activities directly. The costs incurred by the UNDP country office in providing such support services shall be recovered from the administrative budget of the office.
- 3) The UNDP country office may provide, at the request of the designated institution, the following support services for the activities of the programme/project:
  - a. Identification and/or recruitment of project and programme personnel;
  - b. Identification and facilitation of training activities;
  - c. Procurement of goods and services.
- 4) The procurement of goods and services and the recruitment of project and programme personnel by the UNDP country office shall be in accordance with the UNDP regulations, rules, policies, and procedures. Support services described in paragraph 3 above shall be detailed in an annex to the programme support document or project document, in the form provided in the Attachment hereto. If the requirements for support services by the country office change during the life of a programme or project, the annex to the programme support document or project document is revised with the mutual agreement of the UNDP resident representative and the designated institution.
- 5) The relevant provisions of the Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Nations Development Programme signed in 4<sup>th</sup> January 1976 (the "SBAA"), including the provisions on liability and privileges and immunities, shall apply to the provision of such support services. The Government shall retain overall responsibility for the nationally managed programme or project through its designated institution. The responsibility of the UNDP country office for the provision of the support services described herein shall be limited to the provision of such support services detailed in the annex to the programme support document or project document.
- 6) Any claim or dispute arising under or in connection with the provision of support services by the UNDP country office in accordance with this letter shall be handled pursuant to the relevant provisions of the SBAA.
- 7) The manner and method of cost-recovery by the UNDP country office in providing the support services described in paragraph 3 above shall be specified in the annex to the programme support document or project document.
- The UNDP country office shall submit progress reports on the support services provided and shall report on the costs reimbursed in providing such services, as may be required.
- Any modification of the present arrangements shall be effected by mutual written agreement of the parties hereto.

10) If you are in agreement with the provisions set forth above, please sign and return to this office two signed copies of this letter. Upon your signature, this letter shall constitute an agreement between your Government and UNDP on the terms and conditions for the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for nationally managed programmes and projects.

On Be	half of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) UNDP Resident Representative a.i
Signature:	
	Mr. Firas Gharaibeh
Date: 24 April 20	018
On Be	half of the Kingdom of General Commission for Survey
Signature:	
	H. E. Dr Abdulaziz Ibrahim Al-Saab, President, the General Commission for Survey
Date: 24 April	2018

### ATTACHMENT TO ANNEX 3

## DESCRIPTION OF UNDP COUNTRY OFFICE SUPPORT SERVICES

- Reference is made to consultations between the General Commission for Survey (GCS) of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and officials of UNDP with respect to the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for the nationally managed and UNDP-supported project "Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey".
- In accordance with the provisions of the letter of agreement signed in April 2018 and the project document, the UNDP country office shall provide support services for the Project as described below.
- 3. Support services to be provided:

Sup	port Services	Schedule for the provision of the support services	Cost to UNDP of providing such support services (where appropriate)	Amount and method of reimbursement of UNDP (where appropriate)
I.	Revision of substantive studies to check their quality	Throughout project		4% of project annual expenditure
II.	Recruitment of experts (short-term and long- term), including the sponsorship arrangements	Throughout project		
III.	Assistance in getting exposed to best practices	Throughout project		
ſV.	Procurement of professional services and equipment			

Annex 4

TOR

# Annex 7: Substantive Project and Budget Revision

#### **United Nations Development Programme**



### Substantive Project and Budget Revision

**Country: Saudi Arabia** 

Project Title : <u>SAU10-110186</u>: Advisory Services to the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information (GASGI)

UNDAF Outcome(s): N/A

Expected CP Outcome(s): Priority Objective 7: Economic diversification; and national objective 8: Knowledge-based economy.

Expected CP Outcomes: Economic diversification; and Knowledge-based economy.

**Expected Outputs:** Policies to enhance the social effectiveness and efficiency of services sectors. **Implementing Partner:** The General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information

#### **Brief Justification**

This revision intends to add one output to enhance the quality of the geospatial services and products. The project is also extended until 31 December 2021 to finalize pending activities of the previous phase. These activities include sustaining provision of advisory services towards achievement of financial sustainability and contribution to the national economy; and promoting advocacy for a wider visibility of GASGI.

Programme Period (CPD): 2017-2021

Key Result Area (Strategic Plan):

Atlas Award ID: 00089732

Start date: 1 May 2018

End Date: 31 December 2021 Management Arrangements: NIM

2021 AWP budget:	US\$1,600,000
Previous Budget	US\$1,333,333
Total allocated resources:	US\$ 2,933,333
• Regular	
• Other:	
<ul> <li>Government</li> </ul>	US\$2,933,333
Unfunded budget:	0.00
Budget increase:	US\$ <u>1,600,000</u>
General Management Servic	e (GMS): 3%
Direct Project Cost (DPC): 4	%

Agreed by (GASGI):

H. E. Mr. Bandar Ibn Saleh Al-Mussalamani,

President, the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information

Agreed by UNDP: Mr. Adam Bouloukos 30.3-202 **UNDP** Resident Representative

Annual Work Plan (1 January – 31 December 2021)

		Targets		Pasnonsible	PLANNED BUDGET		
EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES		Y2 2021	Party	Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
Output 1: Geospatial data center	1.1 Designing models of data simulation developed	50%	50%	GASGI			350,000.00
established and operational	1.2 Simulating geospatial data sets	40%	60%	GASGI			375,000.00
	1.3 Technical preparation for the implementation of the National Geodetic Reference Frame	50%	50%	GASGI			
Output 2: Capacities developed for efficient delivery of survey services	2.1 Comprehensive training package formulated on survey specialties: law of the sea; land survey; geodetic survey; topographic survey' and Cadastral survey	100%		DOALOS / GASGI			80,877.00
	2.2 Organizing six workshops on marketing of geospatial data among the public and private sectors' institutions	70%	30%	GASGI / UNDP			968,033.00
	2.3 Organizing four training workshops conducted on 1) land survey; 2) geodetic survey; 3) topographic survey and 4) Cadastral survey	50%	50%	GASGI / UNDP			155,000.00
	2.4 Capacity building and awareness initiatives for using the National Geodetic Reference Frame	60%	40%	GASGI			
Output 3: Quality of the geospatial services and products improved and promoted Baseline:	3.1 Conduct a study to scope the geospatial market size and the feasibility of geospatial products and services		100%	GASGI			52,710.00
The Commission's mandate has been recently	3.2 Formulate a marketing strategy		100%	GASGI			32,436.00
modified to focus more on geospatial dimension instead of only on National	3.3 Develop annual plans for implementation of the marketing strategy		100%	GASGI			52,710.00
Geodetic Reference Frame Target:	3.3 Create plan for transforming GASGI as per the new mandate		100%	GASGI			52,710.00
National market of geospatial data fully scoped by 2021	3.4 Conduct sector-related studies for implementation of the marketing strategy		100%	GASGI			85,353.00
A national marketing strategy is in place along	3.5 Design a plan for investment attraction		100%	GASGI			32,436.00
with sector-based studies	3.6 Participate in international events of relevance to excellence in geospatial performance		100%	GASGI			476,097.00
Monitoring and Evaluation and Audit Fees				UNDP			25,000.00
Subtotal							2,738,362.00
General Management Support (3%)				UNDP			85,437.00
Direct Project Costing (DPC) (4%)				UNDP			109,534.00
TOTAL							2,933,333

# **Revised Schedule of Payments**

Payments	Amount in US\$	Contributor
Payment received in 2020	1,333,333	Government of Saudi
Payment to be received in March 2021	1,600,000	Arabia
Total	2,933,333	



### **Capacity Development**

The true and genuine investment of any public or private sector should appropriately be focused on the development of their own workforce through training and qualification. This is due to the effective and huge role of training in developing the capabilities of an organization's personnel and fueling the potential for scoring high levels of performance using advanced techniques and drawing on the abilities of a dynamic work staff capable of using innovative work styles designed to increase productivity. Training and capacity building have a primary role in changing the attitudes of individuals, thanks to the new knowledge and new methods of thinking they would have acquired from the training.

With such new knowledge and experience, a trained individual comes out with a new outlook and a different approach to life and will of course behave himself in a better way. With such improved capabilities and skills, a trained individual would be able to use better concepts and better techniques when faced with special or delicate situations using technical, administrative, mental or behavioral skills or all those skills at the same time.

Since human resources are a key element in improving productivity, training is a constant function for developing and promoting human resources and providing them with modern and sophisticated work techniques with the ultimate goal of improving performance and promoting skills. While the GASGI strives to achieve its pronounced objectives and work activities by using appropriate methods of work performance, it is cognizant that the desired performance levels can only be achieved through a training that must be based on careful planning, flawless implementation and continuous follow up.

Given the great importance attached by the GASGI to the training of both the technical and administrative staff with a view to achieving the best possible results, it is well understood that training can only function as a positive investment if it is carefully directed to match the prescribed goals and objectives and the policies adopted by the GASGI.

The importance of training can be highlighted through the following guidelines:

- 1. Improving the individual's performance as reflected in the increased quantity and improved quality of his production with minimal cost and effort and within the shortest possible time.
- 2. Keeping pace with technological and organizational developments. One feature of technological advancement is the wide-spread use of modern and complicated technological devices putting the GASGI to the new demand of having to train its staff on the use and maintenance of every new generation of those devices.
- 3. Less need for supervision, as a trained employee would be more conscious of the duties and responsibilities of his/her job and may therefore carry out his duties with minimum, or no, supervision or follow up by his supervisors. This, as a result, will make him/her less demanding on their time, thereby allowing them more time to attend to other work. On the other hand, a non-trained worker is typically more demanding on the time of his superiors forcing them to keep a close follow up of his daily work which is counterproductive in the final analysis.
- Improving the services provided by GASGI through the supply of products and services produced and offered by the GASGI which would reflect positively on the promotion of relations between GASGI and its partners.

Achieving stability and sustenance in the workplace as an important element in establishing a good image and good reputation for the GASGI across the community. A well-trained employee will naturally be able to carry out his duties to the satisfaction of the organization and if his efforts are rewarded by a salary increase or other kind incentive he will be encouraged to stay in with more dedication and loyalty to the GASGI.

GASGI shall provide in-kind contribution to DOALOS in terms of office premises, logistics, stationery, and any material necessary for the delivery of the training workshops.

# Annex 8: List of Supporting Documents Reviewed

Advisory Services to the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information (GASGI), Annual Work Plan, UNDP, 2021.

Advisory Services to the General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information (GASGI), Substantive Project and Budget Revision, UNDP, 2021.

Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey, Annual Project Report, GASGI, 2020.

Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey, Annual Project Report, GASGI, 2019.

Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey, Annual Project Report, GASGI, 2018.

Advisory Services to the General Commission for Survey, Implementation Stage, Quality Assurance Report (2018-05-01 / 2021-12-31), UNDP, 2021.

Capacity Development for the General Commission of Survey, Project Document, UNDP, 2014.

Country Programme Document for Saudi Arabia (2017-2021), UNDP, 2016.

Data Modelling Methodology and Principle, GASGI, 2021.

General Authority for Survey and Geospatial Information, Minutes of Meeting, 28 March 2021. UNDP, 2021.

Project Evaluations. Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF financed projects, UNDP, 2012.

Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System Implementation Guidelines, GASGI, 2021.

Saudi Arabia Vision 2030.

Support to the General Commission for Survey, Combined Delivery Report, UNDP, 2018.

Support to the General Commission for Survey, Combined Delivery Report, UNDP, 2019.

Support to the General Commission for Survey, Combined Delivery Report, UNDP, 2020.

Support to the General Commission for Survey, Combined Delivery Report, UNDP, 2021.

Support to the General Commission for Survey, Project Document, UNDP 2018.

Technical Summary for Saudi Arabia National Spatial Reference System (SANSRS), GASGI, 2021.

The Foundation Theme Descriptions for all 12 Foundation Themes written by the Foundation Theme Working Groups, GASGI, 2021.

Umbrella Programme for Socio-Economic Development, Saudi Arabia, Project Document, UNDP 2019.

UNDP Independent Country Program Review Saudi Arabia 2017-2021, January 2021.

UNDP Strategic Plan, 2018-2021, 28 November 2017.

UNDP Support Services to National Implementation.

UN Common Country Strategic Framework 2017-2021 Saudi Arabia, February 2017.