

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *UNDP-GEF “City of Almaty Sustainable Transport” project* (PIMS #3757)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	UNDP-GEF “City of Almaty Sustainable Transport” project			
GEF Project ID:	00076355 (Project ID)		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00060598 (Atlas Award ID)	GEF financing:	4,886,000	4,886,000
Country:	Kazakhstan	IA/EA own:	50,000	50,000
Region:	RBEC/CA	Government:	30,050,000	30,050,000
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other (EBRD&IFC):	46,426,000	46,426,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	76,526,000	76,526,000
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	81,412,000	81,412,000
Other Partners involved:	Akimat of Almaty city	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		20/06/2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 20/12/2017	Actual: 20/12/2017

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to reduce the growth of the transport-related greenhouse gas emissions in the City of Almaty. Achievement of the objectives will be made within the framework of four components while simultaneously improving urban environmental conditions by

- 1) improving the management of public transportation and air quality in Almaty;
- 2) building capacity in Almaty to holistically plan and implement improvements in the efficiency and quality of public transport;
- 3) building capacity to holistically plan and implement integrated traffic management measures in Almaty City;

4) implementing a demonstration project that raises awareness and increases knowledge of sustainable transport.

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

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

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Almaty and Astana, Kazakhstan. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

### CAST Project

#	Name	Title	Organization
1.	Ms. Yelena Yerkovich	Project Manager	CAST project team
2.	Ms. Nessibeli Abdirova	Project Assistant	
3.	Ms. Almara Kalipanova	Logistics Assistant	
4.	Ms. Aida Abirova	PR & Communications Specialist	
5.	Mr. Guido Bruggeman	International technical adviser (Netherlands)	

### UNDP

#	Name	Title	Organization
1	Ms. Marina Olshanskaya	Previous UNDP-GEF RTA	UNDP, Istanbul
2	Mr. Rassul Rakhimov	Head of Sustainable Development and Urbanization Unit	UNDP CO
3	Ms. Irina Goryunova	Head of Strategic Support Unit	

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

**Akimat (Municipality) of Almaty city – Main Partner**

#	Name	Title	Organization
1.	Mr. Rumil Taufikov	Deputy Akim (Mayor) of Almaty city, CAST Project National Director	Akimat (Municipality) of Almaty city
2.	Mr. Maksut Issakhov	Head of Department for Public Transport and Roads of Almaty city	Akimat (Municipality) of Almaty city
3.	Mr. Yerlan Adilov	Deputy Head of Department for Public Transport and Roads of Almaty city	Akimat (Municipality) of Almaty city

**Project Partners**

#	Name	Title	Organization
1.	Mr. Kerey Bekbergen	Head of Department	Ministry of Energy
2.	Ms. Aliya Shalabekova	Head of Department	Ministry of Energy
3.	Mr. Olzhas Sutehmenov	Head of Department, Transport Committee	Ministry for Investments and Development
4.	Mr. Moldabek Abdenov	Chief Expert, Transport Committee	Ministry for Investments and Development
5.	Ms. Gulmira Burkutbayeva	Head of Department	Almaty Development Center
6.	Mr. Sadir Khamrayev	Director	Transport Holding of Almaty city
7.	Mr. Abbas Ofarinov	Principal Banker	EBRD
8.	Ms. Svetlana Spatar or Timur Jurkashev	Members	“Velo-Almaty” initiative group

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

**EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

Project performance assessment shall be conducted based on expectations set out in Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)) which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along corresponding means of verification. The evaluation shall be based on the following criterias: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided as per below specified performance criteria. The complete table must be included in evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating

M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>rating</b>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>rating</b>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE/COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
<b>Grants</b>	0.05				1.676			
<b>Loans/Concessions</b>					44.05			
• <b>In-kind support</b>			30.05					
• <b>Other</b>					0.7			
<b>Totals</b>	0.05		30.05		46.426		76.526	

## MAINSTREAMING

Both UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming as well as regional and global programs. The evaluation shall assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluators shall assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement. Key findings that should be brought in evaluation include whether the project has

demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 working days (for the international consultant) and 18 working days (for the national consultant) over a period of 10 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	7 w.d.	<i>July 2017</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	5 w.d.	<i>First part of August 2017</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	6 w.d.	<i>September 2017</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	2 w.d. (for international consultant only)	<i>September 2017</i>

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 3 weeks before the evaluation mission: due date	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: due date	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Terminal Evaluation Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission: due date	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs

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

<b>Final Terminal Evaluation Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: due date	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
--	----------------	---	---------------------------------------

\*When submitting the final version of the Terminal Evaluation Report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## **DUTY STATION**

Home-based with trips to Astana (2 days) and Almaty (4 days)

## **INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT**

The International Consultant reports on executed work to CAST project manager. All reports must be submitted in English.

The International Consultant will have under his supervision National Consultant that shall provide related findings to the International expert as well as assisting International Consultant in organizing interviews or site visits.

## **TEAM COMPOSITION**

The evaluation team will be composed of one international expert and one local evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

International evaluator must represent the following qualifications:

- University degree in transport planning, engineering, business administration, or other relevant field;
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience in the field of sustainable urban transport;
- Minimum 5 years' experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies in the projects focusing on climate change. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage;
- Expertise in adaptive management, as applied to climate change and energy resource management projects;
- Minimum 5 years of international experience in drafting the institutional documents, reviews and background papers related to sustainable transport policies, sustainable energy, climate changes issues;
- Experience in negotiating or working with key stakeholders and state/municipal authorities as an asset;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF procedures; Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on urban transport (relevant experience in the CIS region is a requirement; and relevant experience within UN system would be an asset);
- Full proficiency of English language including ability to review, draft guidelines and edit required project documentation; knowledge of Russian language (for International expert) would be an advantage

## **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

---

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

#### **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

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

#### **APPLICATION PROCESS**

---

The following documents shall be sent by applicant:

- Signed UNDP P11 form or detailed CV (up to 10 pages);
- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP;
- Cover letter to UNDP with description of similar consultancy assignments and other relevant information related to proposed methodology of work;
- Two recommendation letters from similar projects within last 3 years

\*P11, the template for financial proposal and General terms and Conditions for Individual Contracts could be found here:

<http://www.kz.undp.org/content/kazakhstan/en/home/operations/procurement/ic-contracts.html>

#### **Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

Initially, individual consultants shall be short-listed on the following minimum qualification criteria:

- University degree in Transport Planning, Engineering, Business Administration or other relevant fields;
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience in the field of sustainable urban transport

The shortlisted candidates will be further evaluated based on the following methodology:

#### **Cumulative analysis**

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

*Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and Suggesting the lowest price*

*“compliant/acceptable” can be determined as fully corresponding to the ToR.*

\* *Technical Criteria weight: 70%;*

\* *Financial Criteria weight: 30%*

Minimum passing score for technical evaluation is 70% which is 350 points.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight %</b>	<b>Max. points</b>
<b><u>Academic background and skills</u></b>		
University degree in transport planning, engineering, business administration, or other relevant field;	20%	100
Full proficiency in English including ability to review, draft guidelines and edit required project documentation; knowledge of Russian language would be an advantage;	15%	75
<b><u>Experience:</u></b>		
Minimum 7 years of professional experience in the field of sustainable urban transport;	25%	125
Minimum 5 years of international experience in drafting the institutional documents, reviews and background papers related to sustainable transport policies, sustainable energy, climate changes issues;	15%	75
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation procedures; Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on urban transport (relevant experience in the CIS region is a requirement; and relevant experience within UN system would be an asset);	15%	75
Experience in negotiating with different stakeholders and working for state/municipal authorities as an asset.	10%	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>500</b>

## **LUMP SUM CONTRACT**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

### **Travel;**

All envisaged travel costs including trip to Astana (2 days) or Almaty (4 days) and per diem must be included in financial proposal (UNDP rate per diem for March, 2017 in Almaty city is \$158, for Astana \$177). In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

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



## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective<sup>3</sup></b> To reduce the growth of GHG emissions from the transport sector in the City of Almaty, Kazakhstan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tonnes of CO2eq emissions reductions resulting from transport modal switches to public transport services/ to non-motorized transport modes and other project actions.</li> <li>Number of firm commitments from stakeholders for the implementation of improved public transport services in the City of Almaty</li> <li>Number of financing institutions committed to financing SUT</li> <li>Percent increase in public transit ridership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0 ktonnes CO2  Baseline 2011 emission was estimated at 2.654 million tons CO2eq per year</li> <li>No commitments for improving public transport services</li> <li>No financing institutions committed to financing demo SUT</li> <li>No increase of passenger trips on public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31 ktonnes CO2eq (direct reduction)  308 ktonnes CO2eq (10-year reduction after completion of CAST)</li> <li>At least 2 plans for demonstration of improved public transport services in Almaty City by Year 3</li> <li>1 financing institutions committed to financing demo SUT by Year 2</li> <li>20% increase of share of sustainable transport modes (10-year reduction after completion of CAST)  4% increase of share of sustainable transport modes by Year 5 (along CAST pilot corridors)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports of improved public transport demonstration including surveys of ridership making transport modal switches from car to public transport</li> <li>Reports from surveys of decreased trip times along corridors where integrated traffic measures have been implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring and evaluation activities planned under the project are fully supported and implemented</li> <li>Continued Municipality support for the modernization of the bus fleet to reduce air pollution and GHG emissions</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 1</b> <b>Improved management of public transport and air quality in Almaty City</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of streamlined institutional arrangements for developing and regulating urban transport services</li> <li>Number of streamlined institutional arrangements for monitoring transport-related GHG emissions and other air pollutants for Almaty</li> <li>Number of institutional arrangements for coordinating sustainable mobility policies within the Municipality based on SUTS</li> <li>Number of policy documents on the role of urban mobility on national transport and climate change mitigation policies</li> <li>Number of standard public service contracts of international standard to be used for private operators delivering public transport services to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current institutions unable to advance projects to improve the state of urban transport in Almaty</li> <li>Current institutions unable to advance projects to improve the state of urban transport in Almaty</li> <li>Fragmentation of competences and actions within the Municipality.</li> <li>No documents</li> <li>No effective standard public service contracts for delivery of public urban transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One institutional management plan that streamlines arrangements for developing and regulating urban transport services: Public transport authority set in place in Year 2</li> <li>One institutional management plan that streamlines arrangements for monitoring transport-related GHG emissions and other air pollutants in Year 4</li> <li>One formal Working Group on Sustainable Mobility established within the Municipality, including coordination with urban planning by Year 3</li> <li>One document presenting how national policies are supporting sustainable mobility in cities around the world by Year 5</li> <li>One standard public service contract template for developing improvements in public transit in Almaty is available by Year 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management plans for institutional streamlining related to urban transport</li> <li>Standard public service contract developed following best international standards</li> <li>Revised tender and contract documentation</li> <li>City administration M&amp;E plan to track performance of Private urban transit operators</li> <li>Project publications</li> <li>City monitoring system documentation for GHG and air pollutant monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring and evaluation activities planned under the project are fully supported and implemented</li> <li>Continued Municipality support for the modernization of the bus fleet to reduce air pollution and GHG emissions</li> <li>Reliable data from survey on modal transport switches</li> <li>Firm commitments from all stakeholder for the implementation of integrated BRT projects including financing of project</li> <li>Proposed institutional and regulatory changes are supported by the Municipality</li> <li>Willingness of designated Municipality personnel to effectively manage and monitor public service contracts to deliver improved public urban transport services</li> <li>Legal instruments are promulgated by the</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<p>Almaty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of M&amp;E systems developed</li> <li>Number of trained Municipality personnel in monitoring and managing public service contracts for improved urban transport delivery and monitoring performance of public service contracts GEBs</li> <li>Number of studies on the true costs and benefits and expected subsidies to sustain public transport quality</li> <li>Number of monitoring systems for tracking reduction of transport-related GHG and air pollutant emissions</li> <li>Number of trained Municipality personnel in operating public transport in an efficient, safe and demand responsive manner.</li> <li>Number of trainees on the operation and maintenance of new public transport rolling stock</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No M&amp;E system for monitoring performance of public service contracts</li> <li>Lack of trained personnel in effective management of public service contracts for public transport services</li> <li>No understanding of the cost implications to sustain public transport quality</li> <li>No monitoring system for tracking GHG or air pollutant emissions from transport in Almaty</li> <li>Lack of trained personnel in effective daily operation of public transport</li> <li>No trained drivers and mechanics on the operation and maintenance of public transport rolling stock</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 M&amp;E system for monitoring performance of public service contracts by Year 4</li> <li>5 trained personnel in effective management and monitoring of public service contracts for public transport services and GEB by Year 4</li> <li>One study and expected subsidies to sustain public transport quality in Almaty City by Year 3</li> <li>GHG/air pollutant monitoring system (software, data collection protocols and surveys) to measure and report on CAST direct and indirect GHG emission impact by Year 5</li> <li>5 trained personnel in effective daily management of public transport by Year 2</li> <li>50 trainees on the operation and maintenance of new buses and re-fueling infrastructure by Yr 2</li> </ul>		<p>government in a timely manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willingness of Municipality to implement air quality and GHG monitoring system</li> <li>Lack of interest at the Municipality/Ministry to monitor GHG emissions and air quality</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 2</b> <b>Improved efficiency and quality of public transport services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An optimized public transit route Network developed by a transport-demand model</li> <li>A holistic and integrated Sustainable Urban Transport Strategy and Action Plan</li> <li>Number of training programs, local conferences and workshops, field visits on Sustainable Transport</li> <li>Number of feasibility studies for the development of sustainable transport improvements that include LRT, BRT and feeder routes, parking, cycling and pedestrian areas</li> <li>Investment mobilized in less GHG intensive urban transport</li> <li>Number of new rolling stock procured and operated in the public transit system through old bus exchanges</li> <li>An integrated ticketing system for all public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City public transit network that has poor connections and routings is not an integrated system.</li> <li>Lack of holistic and integrated planning of Sustainable Urban Transport</li> <li>Lack of knowledge on sustainable transport policies, strategies and projects</li> <li>Piecemeal initiatives for the development of sustainable transport in Almaty</li> <li>Moderate investments mobilized for less GHG intensive urban transport</li> <li>No program or plans for modernization of public transport rolling stock of the private sector</li> <li>No integrated ticketing system for public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An optimized public transit route network that has been developed by a new transport-demand model by Year 4</li> <li>One integrated Sustainable Urban Transport Strategy and Action Plan approved by Municipality by end of Year 2</li> <li>At least two conferences and two workshops on international best practice examples organized by Year 4</li> <li>At least 1 feasibility study on developing sustainable transport improvements in Almaty by Year 2</li> <li>Commitments for additional financing of less GHG intensive urban transport at the amount of USD 100 million by Year 5</li> <li>200 old buses exchanged for new buses in the private sector by Year 3</li> <li>1 integrated ticketing system for public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transport development Strategy and plans for urban transport regulatory reform for Almaty City</li> <li>Bankable feasibility implementation plans for SUT development in Almaty</li> <li>Workshops/conferences agenda and reports</li> <li>Study on public transport improvements, real costs and benefits and required subsidies</li> <li>Bus modernization plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Municipality government is willing to support sustainable urban transport development including subsidizing the project</li> <li>Full stakeholder support including existing bus operators</li> <li>Sufficient capital is available to finance bus program and related infrastructure projects</li> <li>Availability of land for bus operations (i.e. maintenance and fueling depots, bus stops and transfer areas)</li> <li>Public transport authority in place; regulatory arrangements and new public service contracts approved, as a basis for the new integrated ticketing system.</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	transport modes in Almaty	transport	transport implemented by Year 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrated ticketing and fares system in place for all public transport services</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 3 Integrated traffic management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of paid parking schemes for Almaty planned and implemented</li> <li>Number of traffic management schemes planned</li> <li>Number of plans for restricting motor vehicle movements along certain corridors to encourage pedestrian and cycling (non-motorized vehicle traffic) and retail economic development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No paid parking schemes being planned</li> <li>Ad-hoc measures taken to improve traffic flows in Almaty</li> <li>No plans for new pedestrians or cycling corridors</li> <li>No plans for traffic calming</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 plan paid parking schemes in downtown core of Almaty and enforcement of parking restrictions in selected areas of Almaty by Year 4</li> <li>One traffic management schemes developed by Year 4</li> <li>1 plan for restricting motor vehicle movement along a selected corridor to encourage pedestrian and cycling corridors and enhance retail economic development by Year 3</li> <li>1 plan for new pedestrian and traffic calming areas by Year 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans for paid parking schemes and enforcement of Parking restrictions</li> <li>Integrated traffic management schemes</li> <li>Plans for urban land use changes with a goal to enhance retail economic development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of parking management policy within SUTS, including coordination among relevant departments at the municipality</li> <li>Municipality government is willing to support paid parking schemes that will generate more revenue for the Municipality</li> <li>Full stakeholder support improving efficiency of motor vehicle movement through synchronized lighting and paid parking spaces</li> <li>Sufficient capital is available to finance integrated traffic measures and associated infrastructure projects</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 4 Demonstration projects on sustainable transport</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bankable engineering plans for demonstration SUT project in Almaty City</li> <li>Number of financing institutions that commit financing assistance to demonstration SUT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No demonstration projects on sustainable transport</li> <li>No financing institutions committed to financing demonstration SUT</li> <li>0 km of operational BRT and LRT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1 demonstration on sustainable transport in Almaty. Definition and roadmap for demonstration by Year 3. Implementation Year 4. Operational by Year 5</li> <li>1 financing institutions committed to financing demo SUT by Year 2</li> <li>One corridor separated bus lanes and one corridor of LRT in operation by Year 5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot projects technical reports</li> <li>Workshops and papers documenting performance of demonstration projects</li> <li>Awareness campaign for demonstration projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Municipality government is willing to support sustainable transport development including subsidizing the project</li> <li>Full stakeholder support including existing bus operators</li> <li>Sufficient capital is available to fully finance the demonstrations</li> <li>Availability of land for LRT, trolley and bus operations (i.e. maintenance and CNG</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of corridors with separated bus lanes and LRT in operation</li> <li>Number of kilometers of improved trolley bus routes in operation</li> <li>Number of on-street parking places removed or regulated under new scheme</li> <li>Number of plans for improving NMT implemented</li> <li>Percent increase in sustainable transport modes ridership</li> <li>Number of actions to promote public awareness on sustainable transport and CAST-project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0 km of improved trolley bus routes in operation</li> <li>Ineffective regulation</li> <li>No plans implemented</li> <li>0% increase on sustainable transport modes ridership</li> <li>No public awareness of Sustainable Transport and CAST-project</li> <li>0 information centers established</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One improved corridors trolley bus service by Year 5</li> <li>500 parking places removed or regulated in connection with new PT corridors and NMT schemes</li> <li>One new pedestrian and cycling corridor implemented by Year 5.</li> <li>One plan for expansion traffic calming zones implemented by Year 5</li> <li>4% increase of share of sustainable transport modes by Year 5 (along CAST pilot corridors).</li> <li>1 public web site and two promo materials about sustainable transport and CAST-project designed by Year 1</li> <li>At least 30% of citizen of Almaty aware about sustainable transport principles by end of Year 4</li> <li>Information center on SUT demo project established in Year 5</li> <li>Website related to improved urban transport in Almaty including channels for</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>fueling depots, bus stops and transfer areas)</li> <li>Relevant stakeholders and target groups are interested in participating and cooperating in the design, development and implementation of the demonstration projects</li> <li>Capacity of project management unit in Municipality /Transport authority to manage pilot project during design/constriction period</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of urban transport information centers established</li> <li>Number of websites related to improved Public transport in Almaty including channels for public participation</li> <li>Number of workshops where experience of demonstration projects is shared</li> <li>Number of papers documenting performance of demonstration projects at reducing transport-related GHG emissions</li> <li>Number of plans for replicating demonstration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0 websites on public transport</li> <li>0 workshops conducted</li> <li>Papers that document Demo project performance</li> <li>0 plans for replicating demo projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>public participation by Year 3</li> <li>3 workshops where experience of demonstration projects is shared completed by Year 5</li> <li>5 papers documenting performance of demonstration projects at reducing transport-related GHG emissions by Year 5</li> <li>2 plans for replicating demonstration projects by Year 5</li> </ul>		

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
2. Project Document (ProDoc) approved by the GEF CEO
3. Request for CEO Endorsement / Approval, approved by the GEF CEO
4. Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
5. UNDP-GEF Project Document signed by UNDP and National Implementing Agency
6. Project Inception Report
7. Mid-Term Evaluation Report
8. Management Response to recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluation
9. Project quarterly (QORs and QPRs) and annual reporting (Project Implementation Reports [PIRs] and Annual Project Implementation Reports [APRs])
10. Minutes of Project Board meetings
11. Project budget and financial data
12. Project GEF Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
13. Reports on monitoring of project office and pilot sites
14. ROARs
15. Project briefs and success stories
16. Project knowledge products
17. Government documentation (as an evidence of project outcomes achieved)
18. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
19. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
20. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
21. GEF focal area strategic program objectives
22. List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
23. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits



## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The list of the evaluations questions but not limited to.

Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project objective fit within the national and municipal priorities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between project objective and national policy priorities and strategies, as stated in official document, as well as stated priorities of municipal stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National policy documents, such as National Transport Strategy, Action Plan for production and use of environmentally friendly transport, etc.</li> <li>National legislation regulations, state target programs related to road transport</li> <li>Relevant regional and local planning documents</li> <li>Government stakeholders at federal level and in two project pilot municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project concept originate from local or national stakeholders, and/or were relevant stakeholders sufficiently involved in project development?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of involvement of municipal and national stakeholders in project origination and development as indicated by number of planning meetings held, representation of stakeholders in planning meetings, and level of incorporation of stakeholder feedback in project planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project developers</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Local and national stakeholders</li> <li>Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project design and project strategy seem adequate for the achievement of the declared objective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project Results Framework is clear and its indicators respond to SMART criteria</li> <li>The project is designed in a way that the route towards achievement of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Brainstorming with the project team and key experts</li> </ul>

	expected results is clear and the project interventions are planned to contribute to the achievement of the overall objectives		
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the planned outputs being produced? Did they contribute to the expected project outcomes and objective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation</li> <li>Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the anticipated outcomes achieved? Did they contribute to the achievement of the project objective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were impact level results achieved? Are they at the scale sufficient to be considered Global Environmental Benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental indicators, first of all – CO2 emission reductions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project reports</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> <li>GEF methodology for CO2 emission reduction calculations for the transport sector</li> </ul>
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were management and implementation arrangements efficient in delivering the outputs necessary to achieve outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of structure of management arrangements</li> <li>Extent of necessary partnership arrangements</li> <li>Level of participation of relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Local, regional and national stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews with project staff</li> <li>Field visit interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the project cost-effective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality and comprehensiveness of financial management procedures</li> <li>Project management costs share of total budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews with project staff</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the project objective met? To what extent and in what timeframe?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of progress toward project indicator targets relative to expected level at current point of implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project reportgs</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was adaptive management being applied to ensure effectiveness?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified modifications to project plans, as necessary in response to changing assumptions or conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was monitoring and evaluation used to ensure effective decision-making?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of M&amp;E plan in terms of meeting minimum standards, conforming to best practices, and adequate budgeting</li> <li>Consistency of implementation of M&amp;E compared to plan, quality of M&amp;E products</li> <li>Use of M&amp;E products in project management and implementation decision-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent were results likely to be dependent on continued financial support?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits</li> <li>Level of expected financial resources available to support maintenance of project benefits</li> <li>Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did relevant stakeholders achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field visit interviews</li> <li>Desk review</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Project staff</li> <li>• Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field visit interviews</li> <li>• Desk review</li> </ul>
---	---	--	---

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluators:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>4</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>5</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>6</sup>)
- 1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>7</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

---

<sup>5</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). The report should conform with terminology requirements of “UNDP-GEF Branding Guidance”.

<sup>6</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>7</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form



## ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_