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**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the 2010 Sustainable Transport and Sport Project**

# Background information

The GEF-funded *2010 Sustainable Transport and Sport Project* was designed not only to serve the transport requirements of the World Cup events, but also to leave a lasting legacy of enhanced sustainable transport behind after the events, thus contributing to a long-term mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from the South African transport sector. The central focus of the project is therefore to support the provision of improved public transport services and non-motorized transport infrastructure in selected 2010 host cities in South Africa. The project is working with various 2010 host cities and selected municipalities across the country to influence transportation policies, build institutional and individual capacities, and raise awareness.

The project objective is: “The promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, coordinated and integrated urban passenger transport system in South Africa, managed in an accountable way to ensure that people experience improving levels of mobility and accessibility.” The project aims to produce measurable environmental benefits, including an estimated 423,000 tCO2 reduction in direct green house gas (GHG) emissions over a ten-year lifespan, air quality improvement and reductions in ambient noise levels. Indirect CO2 emission reductions achieved via replication of the project could be as high as 2 million tCO2 over a ten-year period.

Practical demonstrations of urban transport improvements will be linked to substantial changes in the transport services in selected venue cities for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The project uses various innovative options including High Occupancy Vehicle lanes, non-motorized transport systems, Travel Demand Management (TDM) systems, dedicated bus lanes and rapid bus transit (BRT) systems to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Targeted investments include: construction of a 94 km Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) network in Johannesburg; 33.4km of BRT in Nelson Mandela Bay; 9 km of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes in Mbombela; and cycle paths and walkways in Polokwane (55.5 km), Mangaung (3.8 km) and Rustenburg (10 km).

## Strategic objectives of the programme

The project aims to reduce greenhouse gases from urban transportation in South African cities through the promotion of a long-term modal shift to more efficient and less polluting forms of transport. The main objective is the promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, coordinated and integrated urban passenger system in South Africa, managed in an accountable and accessible way. The following outputs are targeted by the project:

* Restructured public transport system (high-impact mode shift projects) have been supported and are implemented;
* Road management and transport system efficiency improvements have been supported and are implemented;
* Non-motorized transport projects have been supported and are implemented in three venue cities;
* Travel Demand Management projects have been supported in Cape Town and implemented;
* Technical capacity in sustainable transport has been strengthened;
* Increased information and knowledge about sustainable transportation options amongst local and national decision-makers and transport and urban planners; and
* Monitoring and Evaluation tools formulated and implemented.
1. **UNDP/GEF M&E requirements**

Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the 2010 Transport Project management and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) Pretoria with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Service Center.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

1. to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
2. to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
3. to promote accountability for resource use; and
4. to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. The project utilizes a mix of tools including periodic monitoring of indicators as well as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term and final evaluations and audit reports. In particular, the mid-term and final evaluations provide an independent in-depth evaluation of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is also responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.

The Logical Framework Matrix in Section B of the Project Document provides impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. These will form the basis on which the project's M&E system will be built. Detailed M&E policy can be found in the Project Document.

The Programme Management Unit is responsible for day-to-day monitoring activities. The Programme Manager is responsible for the preparation of reports for the Steering Committee and UNDP on a regular basis, including the following: (i) Inception Report; (ii) Annual Project Report; (iii) Quarterly Progress Reports; and (iv) Programme Terminal Report. The Annual Programme Report is undertaken annually, and entails a more detailed assessment of progress in implementation, using the set indicators. The report also evaluates the causes of successes and failures, and presents a clear action plan for addressing problem areas for immediate implementation.

The M&E plan in the Project Document also stipulates that the Mid-term Evaluation will be undertaken before the end of Phase I of the project. The evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. In addition to providing an independent in-depth evaluation of implementation progress, the evaluation which is the subject of the present TORs, responds to both UNDP-GEF’s requirements for Mid-Term Evaluation, as well as GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

A Mid-Term Evaluation of the 2010 Transport Project will be undertaken jointly by the UNDP-GEF during dates October-November 2010 and will use the results of the independent Mid-Term Evaluation.

# Objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE)

The MTE is initiated by the executing agency (Department of Transport) of the Sustainable Public Transport and Sport Project and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO). The MTE will need to be completed in time to inform the October-November 2010 Mid-term Evaluation of the project.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to evaluate progress towards the projects objectives and outputs, identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, validate initial project assumptions and look at critical changes since project design, assess the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs, and provide recommendations on modifications to be introduced after the Mid-Term Evaluation (including project restructuring and funding allocation, governance structure, coordination and management, *etc*.) to increase the likelihood of success.

The primary stakeholders in the MTE are the program’s executing agencies, the members of the Steering Committee, the various project teams and task teams who are managing project components and activities, their steering committees and stakeholders, the UNDP and the GEF. The process and its outcome will also be of interest to other national and international partners.
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# Products Expected from the Evaluation

The MTE evaluator will be expected to produce:

**A) An evaluation report**, of approximately 40-50 pages, as outlined in the section vii.

* A detailed record of consultations with stakeholders will need to be kept and provided (as part of the information gathered by the evaluators), as an annex to the main report.
* If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

**B) A Power Point Presentation** (circa 20-25 slides) covering the key points of the MTE to a joint meeting of the Project Steering Committee and the joint UNDP evaluation and supervision mission (precise date to be agreed).

A draft of both A) and B) above should be submitted within two weeks of the end of the in-country component of the evaluator’s mission, and a final copy within a further week after receiving written comments on the drafts.

The drafts and final versions of the products should be submitted to Mpho Nenweli (mpho.nenweli@undp.org) and David Ingham (david.ingham@undp,org), who will be responsible for circulating it to key stakeholders.

# Methodology or Evaluation Approach

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the MTE will include, but may not be limited to the following:

1) Documentation review including, *inter alia*: -

* + Project Document and Project Appraisal Document;
	+ Project implementation reports (PIR’s);
	+ Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
	+ Audits reports;
	+ Annual Review Reports;
	+ M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
	+ Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

* + The 2010 Transport M&E framework;
	+ Knowledge products from service providers;
	+ Project operational guidelines and systems;
	+ Minutes of the 2010 Transport Project and other project management meetings;
	+ Maps;
	+ The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and
	+ The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
	+ GEF Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Projects.

2) Interviews with: -

* UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
* Staff of the 2010 Transport Project Unit;
* Executing agencies: DoT and municipalities;
* Members of the 2010 Transport Project Steering Committee;
* UNDP Programme Manager for Environment and Energy;
* UNDP RTA for Climate Change Mitigation;
* Project stakeholders and project beneficiaries; and
* Relevant staff of DEA including the Chief Director, Zaheer Fakir.

3. Field Visits

The following municipalities should be visited:

City of Cape Town, Mbombela, Mangaung, Rustenburg, Nelson Mandela Bay, City of Johannesburg and Polokwane.

In addition, **but separate from project staff and their institutions**, the evaluators will need to specifically meet with selected communities (intended beneficiaries of the 2010 Transport Project) during the field visits.

# Evaluation Team—tasks, qualities and requirements

The MTE Evaluator/Team will be responsible for the delivery, content, technical quality and accuracy of the evaluation, as well as the identification of strategic recommendations.

**Specific tasks**

Focusing on the 2010 Transport Project, the MTE will specifically:

* Consider current, and projected, progress towards targets and present a rating of this using the six point rating scale;
* Examine effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of implementation and provide a rating of project implementation employing the six point rating scale;
* Examine project impact to date, including positive and negative, and intended and unintended impacts;
* Meet with key project stakeholders, including institutional representatives, communities, the private sector, NGOs, and academia; Comment on (tracking of) the co-financing for the project;
* Assess the potential development impacts of the project, focusing on (a) benefits delivered by the project, and (b) main beneficiaries of these benefits;
* Assess project sustainability (with a focus on key issues);
* Comment specifically on governance and stakeholder engagement processes;
* Identify deviations, reassess assumptions, consider changing conditions and risks;
* Highlight issues requiring decision or action at Mid-Term Evaluation, and make specific recommendations to ensure that project achieves its development objectives efficiently by closing date (2012);
* Present initial “lessons learned” about project design, implementation and management;
* Finalize the MTE Document; and,
* Present findings of MTE to a joint UNDP evaluation and supervision mission (date).

**Qualification**

The team should ideally have the following competencies and attributes:

**Skills and experiences required**

* Knowledge of the public transport system in South Africa;
* Understanding of policies related to public transport in South Africa;
* Familiarity with the linkages between the transportation sector and climate change;
* Proven expertise in evaluating multifaceted programmes/projects and results-oriented monitoring and evaluation;
* Previous experience in evaluating programmes/project for UNDP or other UN/multilateral agencies is essential; previous
* At least a Master’s degree in Environment, International Development, Economics, Engineering or other relevant field; and
* Excellent writing and communication skills in English.

# Implementation Arrangements

a) Management arrangements – The 2010 Transport Programme Coordination Unit with the support of the UNPD CO will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, and coordinate travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team.

The UNDP CO is fully responsible for the quality assurance of the MTE and the final product.

b) The anticipated time frame for the evaluation: -

Preparation:

* + - Desk review - 5 days
		- Evaluation: Briefings with UNDP CO and UNDP GEF/Regional Service Centre – 1 day
		- Interviews - 5 days
		- Visits to the field – 10 days
		- Analysis against UNDP Project Document – 5 days
		- Presentation of draft to Project Steering Committee and the UNDP review and supervision mission – 1 day
		- Integrate comments and produce final report – 6 day
		- Presentation of final to the 2010 Transport Project Steering Committee – 1 day

Within two weeks of the in-country component

* + - Preparation of draft final evaluation report - 5 days

Within one week of comments on the draft

* + - Revision and finalization of evaluation report – 1 day

The above is subject to amendment based on the detailed proposal that will be presented to the Project Steering Committee.

# Scope of the Evaluation-Specific Issues to be addressed

The components of the evaluations include:

Table of contents

Acronyms

1. Executive summary

* Brief description of project;
* Context and purpose of the evaluation; and
* Main conclusions, rating of progress towards objectives as well as rating of progress on implementation, recommendations and lessons learned.

2. Introduction

* Purpose of the evaluation;
* Key issues addressed;
* Methodology of the evaluation; and
* Structure of the evaluation.

3. The project(s) and its development context

* Project start and its duration;
* Problems that the project seek to address;
* Immediate and development objectives of the project;
* Main stakeholders; and
* Results expected.

4. Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated in conformity with the GEF guidelines for final evaluations using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately, Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Highly Unsatisfactory.

4.1 Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design(R). This should assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.

#  (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation. This should include consideration of the 2010 Transport Project Steering Committee proposed changes. These will be provided at the outset of the evaluation.

(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

(i) The production and dissemination of information and lessons generated by the project.

(ii)Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

(iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing (see Annex 4 of these TORs for reporting of co-financing )

Procurement Management: Including an assessment of:

(i) Technical and human resource capacity for procurement management

(ii) Linkage between work programming, procurement planning, budgeting, and disbursement planning

(iii) Effectiveness of procurement management, as indicated by results of audits (internal and/or external), and reports of the evaluation and supervision missions by IAs.

Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R*):* Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

Sustainability*:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.

Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

5. Recommendations

* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. Recommendations should be specific and clearly justified in relation to the achievement of the project objectives.
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Lessons learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

Evaluation TORs

Itinerary

List of persons interviewed

Summary of field visits, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders

List of documents reviewed

Questionnaire used and summary of results

Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

1. **Proposal and selection process**
2. The successful consultants will be required to submit a detailed proposal and Workplan to UNDP CO for approval. This Workplan will clearly set out the time frames, programme of work and deliverables.
3. *criteria:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Points** |
| Technical merit of proposal (approach, time and deliverables) | 30 |
| Qualification, expertise and competencies of service provider | 30 |
| Employment Equity  | 20 |
| Price | 20 |
| TOTAL | 100 |

1. *Service providers who fail to score a minimum of 30 points out of a possible 60 points on technical merit and qualification criteria will not be eligible for further consideration.*
2. *Note that service providers are required to comply with the processes outlined here. Failure to comply will result in disqualification of proposals:*

**XI. Contractual arrangements**

* The contract will be drawn up between UNDP and the service provider;
* Invoices will be paid for deliverables received as agreed in the contract; and
* Invoices must indicate the delivered outputs.

**How to Apply**

Potential candidates are requested to inquire and, send their brief proposals and CVs to Nokufa Matitoane

e-mail: Nokufa.matitoane@undp.org

Tel: 012 354 8003