

**Final Evaluation of the United Nations Development Account 9<sup>th</sup> tranche  
project**

**“Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of  
selected developing countries and countries with economies in  
transition”**

June 2015 - March 2018

Implemented by

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

**FINAL REPORT**

June 2018

**Evaluator/Consultant:** Dr. Iwona SAFI

**Evaluation Manager:**

Mr. Nenad Nikolic, Regional Advisor, Sustainable Transport Division  
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

**Commissioned by:** United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

## Table of contents

<b>1. Executive summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Introduction.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Evaluation Objective</b>	
<b>Evaluation Scope</b>	
<b>Evaluation Methodology &amp; Limitations</b>	
<b>3. Findings.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Relevance including Design</b>	
<b>Implementation</b>	
<b>Effectiveness</b>	
<b>Efficiency</b>	
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>4. Conclusions, lesson learned and recommendation.....</b>	<b>27</b>

## Annexes

1. Annex1: Terms of Reference
2. Annex2: Lists of reviewed documents
3. Annex3: Evaluation Questions
4. Annex4: Survey Questions
5. Annex5: List of interviewees
6. Annex6: Survey Analysis

## Acronyms & Abbreviations

AL	Albania
DOM	Dominican Republic
EQ	Evaluation Questions
GE	Georgia
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
PAHO	Pan-American Health Organization
PMU	Project Management Unit
RSPR	Road Safety Performance Reviews
RSAP	Road Safety Action Plans
RSCB	Road Safety Coordination Body
SPECA	Special Programme For Economies in Central Asia
SQ	Survey Questions
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDA	United Nations Development Account
ECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
ECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
VN	Viet Nam

### Acknowledgements

Sincere appreciation for the extensive support provided by the Regional Commissions (ECE, ECLAC and ESCAP) and PMU project teams to the overall process of the Final Evaluation and its validation. Gratitude to all the persons interviewed, their contribution was highly appreciated, and the facts and opinions shared played a critical part in analysis stage.

Special recognition to the ECE Evaluation Manager for facilitating this evaluation assignment, governing the evaluation survey, providing access to available project data as well as high responsiveness and availability.

## 1. Executive summary

The purpose of the evaluation is to review the implementation and measure the extent to which the objectives of the “Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition” United Nations Development Account 9<sup>th</sup> tranche Project were achieved. The evaluation criteria were based on the ECE Evaluation Policy;<sup>1</sup> and included relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The evaluation was built around key evaluation questions outlined in the Terms of Reference (Annex 1) it considered the extent to which the project strengthened capacities of the beneficiary countries (Albania, Georgia, Dominican Republic, and Viet Nam) to improve national road safety management system. The stakeholders participating in project and/or influenced by the project, that contributed to the overall evaluation process included National Governments, Ministries, Governmental Institutions, Civil society, NGOs, Media, Academia and International Financial Institutions. The evaluation applied a mixed-methods approach to gather sufficient data for triangulation and cross validation and to establish a solid evidence-basis for further analysis. The evaluation faced certain limitations including, stakeholders’ accessibility and responsiveness (survey), stakeholders’ availability (interviews) and language barriers.

### Initial Findings

(1)<sup>2</sup>The project was highly relevant to the specific needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries in the area of road safety management system. (2) The project was consistent with the global and regional priorities and the programme of work of the UN Regional Commissions. (3) The project design was relevant for meeting its objective. (4) The expected accomplishments of the project have been achieved. (5) There were several challenges encountered by the project, and specific mitigation measures were utilized. (6) The available resources were transformed into the quality outputs and, in principle, within the indicated timeline. (7) The project presented satisfactory capacities and resources. (8) The activities were implemented in principle in according to the agreed timeframe. (9) The project results will continue after the completion of the project in all beneficiary countries. (10) The likelihood of the stakeholders’ engagement in the beneficiary country is high after project completion. (11) The project contributed to capacity building; capacity building processes were utilized and in place.

### Conclusions

The overall final evaluation conclusions are that the project was a significant and valuable capacity building initiative, that meaningfully contributed to the strengthening of capacity building of the road safety management system in targeted countries and that the support to beneficiary countries should be continued. The strategic issues and areas identified within the scope of this evaluation need to be taken into consideration in order to refine capacity building

---

<sup>1</sup> ECE, Evaluation Policy, October 2014

<sup>2</sup>The number corresponds with the Key Evaluation Questions, sub questions are addressed in the Findings section of this report.

approaches in future programming. Across the defined evaluation questions, results are very positive and satisfactory, overall, and placing the project at the excellent rating, with regards to the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, while moderate towards project design (in the relevance section) and sustainability.

## Recommendations

### \*\*Project Design

#### Evaluation criteria – Relevance including project design

- 1) UNDA to consider inclusion, in the proposal template, of the following sections: overall objective at the impact level with the requirement of insertion indicators of achievements; cross cutting issues and specifically gender-sensitive aspects;
- 2) Regional Commission/s to consider drafting project sustainability plan, either during the design stage or as one of the activities within the project timeline. The sustainability plan should define the governmental/national institutions' goals, there should be an identification of the people, roles and departments that will be responsible for leading the sustainability efforts.

### \*\*Project Implementation

#### Evaluation Criteria - Efficiency

- 3) Regional Commission/s (with the participation of the project stakeholders) to draft communication plan/tools, which adequately address internal and external communication at each level (project management, inter-Regional Commissions communication, national project stakeholders, beneficiary countries, donors);

### \*\*Sustainability

#### Evaluation Criteria – Sustainability

- 4) Regional Commission/s (with the participation of the project stakeholders) to develop a comprehensive approach towards capacity building based on the capacity building development framework.
- 5) Regional Commissions to continue engagement with national stakeholders, donor and financial institutions to ensure proper utilization of the RSPR documents in beneficiary countries, advance the result of the programming, advance national capacity road safety management system, through investing into capacity development plan (refer to Recommendation 9).

## 2. Introduction

The ECE in cooperation with ESCAP and ECLAC implemented the project “Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition” within the framework of United Nations Development Account 9<sup>th</sup> tranche. The project was launched in June 2015 and completed in March 2018.

### Evaluation Objective

The objective of the evaluation was to review the implementation and assess the extent to which the objectives of the Project were achieved. The evaluation assessed the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project in strengthening the national road safety management capacities of the beneficiary countries. The results of the evaluation will be used in the planning and implementation of future similar projects, in particular global projects involving several UN Regional Commissions. The findings of the evaluation will inform follow up actions and guide initiatives already started and required to disseminate the knowledge created and enhance its use. The evaluation will also contribute to the broader UNDA programme lessons learned, since it will be available on the project website (ECE sub-page), and submitted to UN DESA in UNHQ.

### Evaluation Scope

The evaluation is guided by the objectives, indicators of achievement and means of verification established in the logical framework of the project document. The evaluation is built around key evaluation questions outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and assesses the project through: (1) Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies; (2) Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; (3) Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results; and (4) Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits.

The evaluation considers the extent to which the project strengthened capacities of the beneficiary countries (Albania, Georgia, Dominican Republic, and Viet Nam) to improve national road safety management. The evaluation covers the full period of implementation from 2015 to 2018.

### Evaluation Methodology and Limitations

The evaluation applied a mixed-methods approach to gather sufficient data for triangulation and cross validation and to establish a solid evidence-basis for further analysis.

The methodology considered gathering feedback on the project accomplishments from key stakeholders including project governmental officials partaking in project activities, external consultants recruited in the course of the project implementation, representatives of the non-governmental sector, academia, donor agency and financial institutions. The consultant also

questioned relevant staff members of United Nations Regional Commissions (RCs) on the strategies, experiences, and challenges encountered within the scope of the project realization.

Information gathering tools incorporate a range of qualitative and quantitative data such as:

- 1) A desk review of relevant documents, obtained from the Project Managers at each Regional Commissions, including country context analysis and strategic priorities and plans of the Regional Commission, Road Safety Performance Reviews of beneficiary countries and others (refer to Annex 2 List of Reviewed Document);
- 2) A survey – electronic questionnaire, in English and Vietnamese language, to assess the perspective of the beneficiary countries, after consultation with ECE, ECLAC and ESCAP (refer to Annex 8 Survey Analyses and Annex 4 Survey Questions);
- 3) Interviews via Skype/Viber with 28 stakeholders out of 32 defined in the stakeholders' coverage sample, what equals 87,5% of expected interviewers with defined stakeholders (refer to Annex 3 Evaluation Questions and Annex 5 List of Interviewees)
- 4) Online research and review of strategic needs, priorities and development plans of relevant national governments with regards to Road Safety Management System (refer to Annex 2 List of Reviewed Document);
- 5) Contextual analysis of stakeholders' feedback on the project's planning, inception and implementation phases.

Key Evaluation Questions (EQs) and supportive sub-questions are summarized in the Evaluation Questions (Annex 3), EQs structured the evaluation work and guided finalization of the Evaluation Report. Survey Questions (SQs) are summarized in Survey Questions (Annex 4). SQs were formulated based on the evaluation criteria and linked with the EQs; to respond to the ToR requirement, "to assess the perspective of the beneficiary countries, after consultation with ECE, ECLAC and ESCAP".

The inherent limitations foreseen for this evaluation have been assessed along with the steps that could be taken to mitigate their negative impacts. The main limitations identified include: stakeholders' accessibility and responsiveness (survey), stakeholders' availability (interviews) and language barriers. Despite the survey having been disseminated widely to relevant project stakeholders, the response rate was relatively modest, despite significant efforts to follow up and reminder notices communicated by the Regional Commissions Project Managers.



### 3. Findings

#### **\*\*Project Design**

##### **Relevance including project design**

*(1)<sup>3</sup>The project was highly relevant to the specific needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries in the area of road safety management system.* The project activities were implemented in developing and countries with economies in transition: Albania, Georgia, Dominican Republic, and Viet Nam. The selection of countries was based on the mortality and motorization growth rates in the country regions and the country's required assistance to improve the national road safety situation and the road safety management system. The governments of the beneficiary countries have committed to undertake interventions to improve road safety performance. Prior to project commencement, consultation with the selected countries were conducted and each expressed their interest to participate in the project to enhance their national road safety management system and contribute to the implementation of UN road safety legal instruments.

At the stage of situation analysis and decision process, related to country selection, the mortality rate per 100,000 population in 2010 in the countries which are part of the proposed project was: Albania (12.7) and Georgia (15.7), Dominican Republic (41.7) and Vietnam (24.5).<sup>4</sup> There were significant gaps in efficient road safety management systems in all countries and the need to undertake a comprehensive review of the Road Safety Performance to define specific national recommendations addressing the system advancement.

The beneficiary countries communicated an official request to the relevant Regional Commissions to take a part in the project, therefore validating high relevance of the project to the national needs. Moreover, the fact-finding missions were dedicated to delve into the country needs and ensure the appropriateness of intervention to the national priorities.

According to the survey results the 47,73 respondents strongly agreed and 43,18% agreed that the project was relevant to the beneficiary country national priorities. (Please refer to Annex 8 Survey Analysis)

*(1.1) The project responded to the needs of the target groups in beneficiary countries.* During the proposal development stage, moderate stakeholders' analysis had been conducted, however soundly reinforced further by the fact-finding missions. The project stakeholders have been defined and described, but not quantified in the project document. The target groups have been identified with corresponding assets and gaps.<sup>5</sup> The information was general and, as already mentioned, complemented by information pertaining to specific needs at the national

---

<sup>3</sup>The number corresponds with the key/sub Evaluation Questions.

<sup>4</sup> In comparison to the indexes in best-performing countries: Sweden (3.0), United Kingdom (3.7) and the Netherlands (3.9). Global status on road safety 2013 published by World Health Organization.

<sup>5</sup> Information related to stakeholders' gaps and assets is included in the project document.

level through the fact-finding missions.

According to the survey results 45,45% respondents strongly agreed and 43,18% agreed that the project was relevant to specific needs of road safety stakeholders. (refer to Annex 8 Survey Analyses)

***(1.2) The project supported the policies and was in line with the existing policy in the beneficiary countries.*** The project was aligned with the legislative framework of the beneficiary countries, and relevant transport management regulations and laws, as well as technical regulations.<sup>6</sup>

***(2) The project was consistent with the global and regional priorities and the programme of work of the UN Regional Commissions - ECE, ESCAP and ECLAC.*** This intervention is a significant initiative implemented within the framework of global and regional priorities as related to the road safety management system. The project has contributed to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal 8 “Develop a global partnership for development”. Furthermore, the project was directly aligned with the 2011-2020 the United Nations Decade of Action for Road Safety, with a goal to stabilize and reduce the forecast level of road traffic fatalities around the world by increasing activities conducted at the national, regional and global levels<sup>7</sup>. In addition, the project is fully aligned with the General Assembly resolution, “The future we want”, endorsed during the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012<sup>8</sup>. Road safety is a core element of sustainable transport as a means of improving social equity, health, resilience of cities, urban-rural linkages and productivity of rural areas<sup>9</sup>.

Furthermore, the project is entirely in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’s (2015)<sup>10</sup> Goal 3 “Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages” and Goal 11 “Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable and their relevant targets”.<sup>11</sup>

***(2.1) The project was aligned with the policy/strategic priorities related to road and the programme of work of the Regional Commissions related to Road Safety Management System Programming.*** The project was an integral part of all Regional Commissions regulatory, analytical and technical assistance work activities. The project was aligned with activities (a),

---

<sup>6</sup> Detailed information related to national level relevance is included in the relevant RSPR. As per agreement with Project Management and due to the limitation of the pages of Final Report, the information about the policy level relevance has been not included in this Evaluation Final report.

<sup>7</sup>A/RES/64/255.

<sup>8</sup>A/RES/66/288.

<sup>9</sup>A/68/L.40.

<sup>10</sup>A/70/L.1

<sup>11</sup> Target: “3.6 By 2020, halve the number of global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents”;

Target: “11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons”.

(c), (d) and (h) of the ECE's Working Party on Road Traffic Safety's programme of work for 2014-18 (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2013/8/Rev.1), as well as objectives 1 (Boost political will and support government strategies), 6 (Make roads safer) and 11 (Raise awareness, fundraise and advocate for road safety) of the ECE's plan to implement the UN Decade of Action for Road Safety (ECE/TRANS/2012/4). The project is in line with the ECE strategic direction "Together with ECE on the road to safety" (2015).<sup>12</sup> The project was consistent with ESCAP resolution 68/4 of 23 May 2012 providing a broad mandate to the ESCAP secretariat under the Regional Action Programme (RAP), phase II (2012-2016)<sup>13</sup> to assist member countries in meeting their commitments under the Decade of Action of Action for Road Safety (2011-2020), as well as, resolution 48/11 of 23 April 1992 on road and rail transport modes in relation to facilitation measures. The project, as well, was in line with ECLAC's Mesoamerican Transport's Strategic Framework.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, in the project document the UN programming was listed as to which current intervention will contribute.

*(3) The project design was relevant for meeting its objective;* The project design addressed the requirements that contributed to the enhancement of the road safety management systems. Though there were no specific indicators set to measure the level of achievement at the objective level.

The project aimed at supporting beneficiary countries to address their priorities in road safety needs by improving the national road safety management systems. Setting efficient road safety management system allows the target groups of the beneficiary countries to comprehend national level road safety challenges and proceed with the efforts to reduce the number of road deaths and injuries. Engagement of the target groups in the RSPR development process was directly aligned with capacity building processes and led to defining the national priorities by the project stakeholders.

The overall project strategy to respond to the needs of strengthening road safety national capacities included assessment of the country road safety situations and road safety management systems through the RSPR. The assessment was conducted in all targeted countries in order to identify: limitation in capacities, financial and human resources, necessary statistical capabilities and other economic or social problems, which had prevented countries from establishing or upgrading their road safety management system. Other aspects, such as identification of gaps in national legal and regulatory frameworks, compliance with international road safety instruments and coordination of road safety stakeholders, were addressed in the RSPR. The most critical aspects and priority needs, in road safety management systems, were identified and taken into account in recognizing relevant priority areas, and national capacity building workshops were organized to enhance national road safety management system capacity.

---

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/main/wp1/wp1doc/ECE\\_TRANS\\_255\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/main/wp1/wp1doc/ECE_TRANS_255_FINAL.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> E/ESCAP/68/17

[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=E/ESCAP/68/17&Lang=E](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/ESCAP/68/17&Lang=E)

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.cepal.org/sites/default/files/pages/files/sf20142015officialdoceng.pdf>

*(3.1) The conception of the project contemplated a complementary and integrated intervention; the logical framework was of sufficient quality, but there was a room for improvement.* The project objectives and achievements (results at the outcome level) are well formulated; however, as already mentioned, the objective was not supported by the indicators of achievement. The overall objective (impact level) is not formulated. Moreover, the objective (and/or overall objective) should have indicated the change (impact level) expected from the intervention. These proposal design requirements were not requested by the UNDA application format.

The vertical logic shows the association between the achievements and activities. The achievements are set at the outcome level. The horizontal logic stipulates indicators, which are well formulated, demonstrating required change at the outcome level. There are no outputs specified in the logical framework document. The proposal and logical framework document identifies specific risks and assumptions; and these hold true. The sustainability aspect was addressed, only generally, in the project document. (refer to section 9 Project Sustainability)

The design limitations are aligned with the fact that the ECE utilized the application templates, as per UNDA requirements. The project follows the mechanism of internal evaluation as defined by the ECE Evaluation Policy.

*(3.2) The indicators were reasonable formulated at the accomplishments level to monitor and measure project performance.* As already mentioned, there was no indicator set at the objective level. The project formulated two major accomplishments that can be accounted as the results at the outcome level and these are supported by one indicator of achievement at each result:

- 1) "Enhanced national capacity of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition to identify the most critical aspects and priority needs in their road safety situation", and this accomplishment is measurable via the following indicator, "Road Safety Performance Reviews are prepared and validated by beneficiary countries."

The particular limitations pertain to a lack of quantification relating to direct beneficiaries and specification of the base line, which should be directly linked with the needs assessment pertaining to capacity building processes. It is apparent that the national capacity to "identify the most critical aspects and priority (...)" have been enhanced (refer to the section 4 Effectiveness), but it is challenging to indicate to which extent the capacity of the beneficiary countries has increased. One of the measurement tool, mentioned in the project document, stipulates an assessment form after the project workshops; however, there is no reference in the project logical framework related to the means of verification that should be supported by the relevant tools, for example pre & post workshop/training questionnaire.

- 2) Enhanced capacity of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition to effectively address and improve road safety in priority areas as identified in the Road Safety Performance Reviews; and this accomplishment is measurable via the following indicator, "beneficiary countries identify specific measures to implement recommendations resulting

from Road Safety Performance Reviews and improve road safety management”.

It is feasible to measure via this indicator whether the target groups “identify specific measure (..)”; the restraint of this indicator refers to a lack of quantification relating to direct beneficiaries. However, specification of the particular tools, should be considered, for the measurement how “effectiveness” (included in the project accomplishment) will be assessed, as the achievement stipulates “effectively addressed”.

*(3.3) The intervention was designed in consultation with the relevant Regional Commissions; while with the target groups/beneficiaries the consultation was proceeded via the usual procedure based on the intergovernmental processes.* The design was developed upon consultation with the project management at the relevant Regional Commissions. The selected countries have been approached and their commitment towards the project have been confirmed by formal documentation presented in the form of letters from the concerned ministries.

*(3.4) The project design does not call attention to crosscutting issues.* The cross cutting issues are not stipulated in the project document nor the logical framework. There are no set of indicators that could measure and support verification as to whether the project benefits accrue to women as well as men, and how the gender aspect is affected by the project activities. As already mentioned, the project used the UNDA template in the phase of proposal formulation and the cross-cutting section was not included in the template of 2015 version.

#### **Summary of findings – Project Relevance including design Relevance**

\*\*The situation in the beneficiary countries at the time of the project development and inception required support to advance the road safety management system;

\*\*The Regional Commissions technical assistance was requested by the Governments of beneficiary country through formal communication;

\*\*The project was aligned with the national policy/strategic priorities, global and regional priorities of UN Regional Commissions;

#### **Design**

\*\* The project design was relevant for meeting its objective;

\*\*The conception of the project contemplated a complementary and integrated intervention;

\*\*The Regional Commissions followed up the UNDA proposal template and it did not require inclusion of the overall objective at the impact level, objective indicators and cross cutting issues; therefore, the project design did not stipulate indicators of achievements at the project objective level;

\*\* The sustainability was addressed generally and sustainability plan was not integrated into the project design and implementation.

Taking into consideration all the above facts the proven needs based on the mortality rate per 100,000 population in 2010, request from the government of each beneficiary country, the alignment of the objectives with the mandates of the engaged stakeholders (Regional Commissions, government and national actors), the aptness of project design based on the needs assessment (supported further by fact-finding missions), the project relevance is rated excellent, despite design limitations, which were inked with the requirements of the UNDA proposal template.

The project relevance is rated “EXCELLENT”, while the project design is accounted as “MODERATE”

**\*\*Project Implementation**

**Effectiveness**

*(4) The expected accomplishments (results at the outcome level) of the project have been achieved.* The level of achievement has been measured based on the objectively verified indicators set at the accomplishment (result/outcome) level. The limitations, at the design of indicators stage, have already been stipulated in the relevance section, and remains valid.

Expected Accomplishment/ outcome level	Indicator of achievement	Findings	Achievement
<p><b>EA1</b> Enhanced national capacity of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition <u>to identify the most critical aspects and priority needs in their road safety situation</u></p>	<p>Road Safety Performance Reviews (RSPR) <u>are prepared and validated by the beneficiary countries.</u></p>	<p>All targeted countries (AL, GE, DOM, VN) Road Safety Performance Reviews were completed, discussed and validated by beneficiary country.</p> <p>The RSPRs were published on the project website for AL, GE, DOM and VN.</p> <p>Engagement of the national stakeholders in the targeted countries and their participation in the development process of RSPR may indicate potential capacity advancement to identify</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>As per the indicator of achievement, <b>result 1 has been accomplished in all beneficiary countries.</b></p>

		<p>the most critical aspects and priority needs in their road safety situation. However, it is challenging to assess to which extent the capacity of the targeted countries have enhanced as the indicator refers to the target groups (no quantification included) but does not indicate the changes at the beneficiary level. (refer to section 3.2)</p>	
<p><b>EA2</b> Enhanced national road safety management system capacity of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition to <u>effectively address and improve road safety in priority areas as identified in the Road Safety Performance Reviews</u></p>	<p>Beneficiary countries <u>identified specific measures to implement recommendations</u> resulting from Road Safety Performance Reviews (RSPR) and <u>improve road safety management system.</u></p>	<p>AL- the recommendations of RSPR to strengthen road safety management capacities were taken into consideration. The Ministry (MoIE) kept road safety unit to be a secretariat of the RSCB;</p> <p>DOM – the project assisted in establishment of INTRANT and project recommendations were taken into account in the new Road Safety Law.</p> <p>GE – The 2017 and 2018 Road Safety Action Plans (RSAP) were based on RSPR recommendations. More than 50% of proposed measures in 2017 RSAP were based on the RSPR findings. The project assisted in the re-introduction of PTI for passenger’s cars.</p> <p>VN- The RSPR recommendations on traffic rules and road signs and signals, has been taken into account in the revision of 2008 Law on Road Traffic.</p> <p>Through the process of</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>As per the indicator of achievements, <b>result 2 has been accomplished.</b></p>

		<p>engagement, contributing to the creation/support of available national platform/system the national stakeholders had an opportunity to participate in the identification of specific measures to implement recommendations resulting from the RSPR.</p>	
--	--	--	--

***(4.1) The project design does not stipulate indicators of achievements at the project objective level.*** Therefore, it is challenging to assess whether the project objective has been achieved. (refer to section 3.1) Nevertheless, taking into consideration that two project accomplishments, at the outcome level have been achieved, it can be considered that it is evident that the project contributed to the achievement of its objective and strengthened the national road safety management system capacity in the beneficiary countries.

The validation of the achieving project objective has been performed based on analysis of the results' achievements and further triangulation through desk review and discussion with the project stakeholders and survey. According to the survey results 22,73% strongly agreed and 54,55% agreed that the objective of the project was achieved. (refer to Annex 8 Survey Analyses)

***(4.2) The project has contributed to strengthening the national road safety management system capacities in the targeted countries.*** However, it is challenging to assess to what extent the capacity of the targeted countries has increased, as analyzed in the above section. (please refer to the 3.2) The survey respondents clearly indicated that the national road safety management system capacities have been increased (refer to the above section 4.1)

***(4.3) There were unexpected positive effects on the target groups, which occurred during the project implementation.*** These include the following: better cooperation between the Regional Commissions (identification of best practices to promote road safety legal instruments and operational tools), increased recognition, by the government, of the NGOs' role, as a counterpart in addressing road safety issues, Government and NGOs improved responsiveness and active/high participation in project activities, as well as, a high level of integration of different stakeholders during the policy level consultation, better Media receptiveness and increase of interest to reflect adequately on road safety issues, further Government and other organization support to broaden the project impact through investment in additional activities (refer to the section 6), as well as, cross-sectorial approach between infrastructure, mobility, and road safety. No negative effects have been reported.



*(5) There were several challenges encountered by the project, and specific mitigation measures were utilized to overcome the difficulties and ensure achievement at the project accomplishment and objective levels.* The major challenges were stipulated by the project stakeholders and these were addressed, well thought out, and mitigation measure were utilized.<sup>15</sup>

*(5.1) The project adapted well to changing external and internal conditions.* As indicated, in the above section, the project management function, at each Regional Commission with the support of ECE as a lead partner, took adequate measures to adapt to the external conditions to ensure the achievement of the project.

*(6) The available resources were transformed into the quality outputs and, in principle, within the indicated timeline.* The project has been moderate in utilizing available financial resources at each Regional Commission level despite the expressed limitations (limited budget). Implementation rate according to the project final report equals 87.75%, and this indicates over 12% of unspent funds. At the same time, the project was able to secure additional funding to contribute to greater results achievement. Vietnam Ministry of Transport, Department of Traffic Safety supported the expansion of the capacity building workshop ensuring the extension of two workshops, one from one day to two days and two workshops from two days to seven, in the North and South regions; International Alliance for Responsible Drinking (USA) provided experts with recommendations to prepare RSPR chapter to combat drink-driving and support presentation of report findings (AL, GE, DOM, VN); and the International Road Federation (USA) supported the project through provision of experts to review RSPR chapter on safer roads with recommendations (AL, GE). Some delays occurred related to introduction of UMOJA system and the project agreed to compensate for the slight delay in implementation of activities A1.1-A1.3 by accelerating implementation of activities A1.4 and A2.2.

Moreover, ECE, efficiently redeployed unspent funds from another project activities to increase the positive results of the project. In cooperation with the UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Road Safety and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), ECE held a three-day workshop in Geneva (2017) on Road Safety Performance Reviews with participation of stakeholders from Albania and Georgia (UNDA financed project) and Cameroon and Uganda (UNSG SE financed project) and international organization (IARD and IRF). Furthermore, one additional policy dialogue and capacity building event took place in Georgia (2018) with participation of stakeholders from Albania and Georgia.

*(6.1) The inputs and resources were available to proceed with project implementation as agreed.* As indicated by the project management functions, the inputs and resource were available to commence with the project activities, there were slight delays, mainly related to the UMOJA introduction, however, it has not significantly impacted the activities realization. (refer to section 5)

---

<sup>15</sup>For detailed information about the challenges and mitigation measures refer to the project final report.

**(6.2) The inputs were monitored regularly on monthly basis at the Regional Commissions level and by ECE at the overall project level.** Despite the budget limitations, the project was able to encourage (alignment with supplementary funding and redeployment of unspent fund from other activities) a cost-effective implementation of activities, there were, also, specific savings and a request for a three-month project extension allowed further utilization of available financial resources. (please refer to section 6)

**(7) The project presented satisfactory capacities and resources, which responded to the requirements of the objective and accomplishments.** However, the project management functions, at each Regional Commission level, had indicated that additional human resource capacity, to handle administrative and logistic tasks, would be beneficial.

**(7.1) The available resources were transformed into quality outputs and in principle within agreed timeline.** The project has been successful in utilizing available human resources at each Regional Commission level. (refer to the section 8) Some minor delays occurred (mainly related to UMOJA introduction), but did not have particular impact on the final achievements. (refer to section 5). Despite other programmatic engagement and limited human resources, all Regional Commissions were highly successful in accurate utilization of the available human potential.

**(7.2) The project management at each Regional Commission level was effective and efficiently governed the project implementation.** The project management mechanism has been stipulated in the project document, and Terms of Reference for Project Stakeholders has been created to address the management structure at the project level, taking into consideration the engagement of the national stakeholders; the document included specific role and responsibilities of the lead entity ECE, partner entities ECLAC and ESCAP, national focal institutions and national consultant in beneficiary countries. The project has completed a final evaluation, as per the Term of Reference attached to this report. The transport division at ECE led and coordinated the intervention in cooperation with ECLAC and ESCAP. ECE, as a lead partner, coordinated the overall project, developing project related tools/templates in consultation with the Regional Commissions counterparts. The content of the RSPR was consulted in close cooperation with Regional Commissions and beneficiary countries. Regional Commissions were in charge of organizing the fact-finding missions and workshops, that took place in the respective region, as well as recruiting national consultants to proceed with the development of the RSPR in coordination with the governmental stakeholders. The ECE was in charge of developing a web page as part of the Sustainable Transport Division web in consultation with the other Regional Commissions.

**(7.3) The annual reports were produced accurately, on time and responded to the reporting requirements of UNDA.** ECE, as an implementation/managing agency, was in charge of coordination and submission of the annual narrative and financial report to the UNDA; and ECE responded to this requirement in a quality and timely manner. ECE submitted to UNDA two annual reports covering the project implementation in 2015 and 2016. The ECE Project Management Unit (PMU) supported the project management in the overall project

management cycle and provided quality assurance. The reports were submitted on time and included all necessary features of adequate reporting, as per requested UNDA template. The ECE Project Manager was in charge of project monitoring and ensuring fulfillment of the requirements related to arrangement of final project evaluation. Kick-off video conferences took place, ad hoc meetings took place, the project timeline was agreed upon and this management tool was sufficient to meeting the Project Management needs (adequate meeting, missions' documentation, monitoring practice, addressing challenges reported by Project Managers at the Regional Commissions). The entire project team, at each Regional Commission level, was highly committed and motivated to proceed with the implementation of the tasks assigned, this indication has been stated by majority of interviewees and further consultant's analysis of the approaches of the project management team.

### Efficiency

*(8) The activities were implemented in principle in according to the agreed timeframe; the project requested extension with a category of the project with outstanding achievements.*

The extension was justified by the following reasons:

- 1) The situation in Dominican Republic, where a new transport body (INTRANT) was created and in the process of finalizing operational arrangement, as such the project could further contribute to capacity building of INTRANT new staff. There was a high level of support and interest from the governmental stakeholders to participate in the final seminar and other related activities that were initially scheduled for November.
- 2) ECE region was able to accommodate savings in the workshop and seminar budget, with further opportunity to proceed with an additional capacity building event to strengthen national capacities on the most pressing issues identified in the RSPR.

All project activities were implemented, and these include:

Planned Activities	Findings	Achievement
<b>A1.1</b> Organize four preparatory missions by relevant Regional Commission staff to the beneficiary countries to discuss with national authorities the objectives, outlines and timelines of the Road Safety Performance Reviews.	The preparatory missions were organized in respective countries engaging 8 government and civil society in AL, 8 from DOM, 14 from GE and 10 from VN. As a result, the outline and timeline for RSPR were agreed with the beneficiary countries.	<b>Achieved</b>
<b>A1.2</b> Organize four fact-finding missions by relevant Regional Commission staff and project consultants to the beneficiary countries to interview national authorities and other stakeholders.	The five fact-finding missions were organized in respective countries attended by 3 government institutions and civils society from AL, 11 from DOM, 15 from GE, and 10 from VN. As a result, RSPR was agreed with NFI and national experts.	<b>Over Achieved</b>
<b>A1.3</b> Organize four final missions by relevant Regional Commission staff and project	The final missions were organized in respective countries.	<b>Achieved</b>

consultants to the beneficiary countries to present the main findings of the final draft Road Safety Performance Reviews to the national authorities and other stakeholders (back to back with A2.1).		
<b>A1.4</b> In collaboration with national governments, finalize the Country Road Safety Performance Review by relevant Regional Commission staff and project consultants, translate, publish and launch the Road Safety Performance Reviews in English and the relevant national language;	The RSPR in each beneficiary country was prepared in English; version in national languages were shared with the National Focal Points for further distribution; RSPR are published on the project web-page.	<b>Achieved</b>
<b>A2.1</b> Organize four capacity-building one-day national workshops to initiate national dialogue on the Road Safety Performance Reviews, and to provide training in priority areas identified in the reviews (back to back with A1.3)	The capacity national workshops were organized in each beneficiary countries. In VN the workshops targeted 75 national experts and have been expanded to 7-days with no additional costs to the budget. Extra expenses were covered by the Government of VN.	<b>Over Achieved</b>
<b>A2.2</b> Organize four follow up capacity-building two-day national workshops on the accession and implementation of UN road-safety related legal instruments.	The follow up capacity building workshops were organized in each beneficiary countries. In VN the workshops targeted 113 national experts; while in DOM additional ECLAC funds were utilized to allow the road safety stakeholders participation in Regional Road Safety Workshop held in Buenos Aires, Argentina	<b>Over Achieved</b>
<b>A2.3</b> Create project web page as part of the ECE Transport Division web presentation where relevant project activities and results are published in order to disseminate project results and the best practice;	The project web page was developed and information on project results along with the produced outputs from beneficiary countries are accessible on line on the ECE web site.	<b>Achieved</b>

***(8.1) There were a number of quality outputs delivered during the framework of the project.***

The outputs produced during the framework of the project included preparatory missions, fact-finding missions, final missions, RSPR documents, capacity-building national workshops, to

initiate national dialogue on the RSPR, follow up capacity-building national workshops on the accession and implementation of UN road-safety related legal instruments and project web page. The outputs were of quality and highly appreciated by all interviewed project stakeholders.

The assessment of the outputs quality has been based on the statement of majority of interviewees, further consultant's analysis of the and survey results. According to the survey results 27,27% respondents strongly agreed and 54,55% agreed that the RSPR produced by the project was of high quality. Moreover, 31,82% respondents strongly agreed and 43,18% agreed that the National Workshops implemented by the project were of high quality. (refer to Annex 8 Survey Analyses).

***(8.2) The communication between project management and other project stakeholders was adequate.***

The following communication levels have been analyzed:

1) Project Management

The interaction between project management was adequate and Regional Commissions expressed their appreciation for an opportunity to cooperate with other agencies within UN system. However, there is still room for improvement in order to ensure that communication is among all Regional Commissions and not only between the Regional Commissions. The ECE as a project management unit had quality communication with the project managers from other Regional Commissions (on one to one basis); however, there was no adequate communication among all three Regional Commissions partners.

2) Project stakeholders

-At the national level

The interaction between project stakeholders at the national level was adequate and appreciated by the project stakeholders in each beneficiary country.

-At the country to country level

AL and GE had an opportunity to utilize the available communication platform during the events and proceeded with an exchange of expertise and discussion on modalities best practices and road safety policies used in other countries

There were different opinions among project stakeholders as some would have appreciated the possibility of interacting with target groups from other countries, while others either regretted that they did not have an opportunity to express their interest to interact with advanced countries on the specific baggage of lesson learnt.

3) Project (management/stakeholders) – Donor/financial institutions. The project management moderately utilized means of communication to address better synergies and potential future programming with other stakeholders (UN agencies, INGOs, EU funded programs/projects etc.).

### Summary of findings – Project Implementation

#### Effectiveness

\*\* The expected accomplishments (results at the outcome level) of the project have been successfully achieved.

\*\*The project utilized appropriate mitigation measures to counter the challenges that occurred during the project implementation

\*\*The available resources were transformed into the quality outputs and, in principle, within the indicated timeline.

\*\*The project presented satisfactory capacities and resources, which responded to the requirements of the objective and accomplishments.

\*\*The available resources were transformed into quality outputs and in principle within agreed timeline.

\*\*The project management at each Regional Commission level was effective and efficiently governed the project implementation.

#### Efficiency

\*\*The activities were implemented in principle in according to the agreed timeframe; the project requested extension with a category of the project with outstanding achievements.

\*\*There were a number of quality outputs delivered during the framework of the project.

\*\*The communication between project management and other project stakeholders was adequate.

Taking into consideration all the above facts the successful achievement of the project accomplishments, the utilization of correct mitigation measures to counter the challenges, the excellence of transformation of available resources into the quality outputs; the alignment of the capacities and resources to the requirements of the objective and accomplishments, production of quality outputs, the quality project management, the achievements at the activities implementation level, the extension request submitted as the project with outstanding achievements, the number of quality outputs produced - the project implementation is rated excellent.

**The project implementation -effectiveness and efficiency- is rated EXCELLENT**

## **\*\*Sustainability**

### ***(9) The project results will continue after the completion of the project in all beneficiary countries.***

The assessment of project sustainability has been considered at the following levels:

- 1) Institutional sustainability, referring to adequate institutional environment to sustain the project results (structure, system, mechanism, tolls etc.) and/or sustain the organizational structure developed by the project - The project contributed to the initiation and/or strengthening of the institutions operating at the national level. The RSPRs provided, to the national institution, a basic framework in the form of recommendations (action plans) referencing the quality of the road safety management system, including institutional set up. Endorsement of the RSPR, by the government, provides a sound basis for sustainability, including sustainability at the institutional level. Moreover, all beneficiary countries will continue their participation in the ECE, ESCAP and ECLAC road safety intergovernmental meetings, receiving through this process necessary guidance and further support. In regards to DOM, the project contributed to the establishment of INTRANT<sup>16</sup> that is composed of many governmental institutions, in single national responsible authority, in charge of regulating the transport sector, including road safety.

- 2) Technical sustainability, pertaining to technical knowledge and skills acquired by the target groups as a result of the project.

The overall process of RSP development have been supported by ten capacity building workshops, which provided opportunities for the participants to enhance their technical and policy instrument knowledge pertaining to road safety. During the workshops, the national stakeholders went through the process of identifying priority areas and, as such, they were able to raise their capabilities in this particular aspect. The participants, as well, developed an increased awareness of the importance of acceding to and implementing key UN road safety related legal instruments. (taking into consideration the limitation already stipulated in section 3.2) It is worth noting that the technical sustainability achieved in the VN project significantly contributed to strengthening national road safety capacities by improving infrastructure safety, in both urban and rural roads, on road safety audit targeting 75 certified road safety auditors (transport officers from provincial transport departments throughout the countries). The project increased the number of certified road safety auditors in Vietnam by 10 per cent.

- 3) Policy sustainability, guaranteeing structural impact of the intervention on improving legislative framework.

The RSPRs in all beneficiaries, provided a sound basis for development of national road safety policy documents. The project supported better policy-making for road safety, contributing to SDG targets 3.6 (half the global number of deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents by 2020) and 11.2 (provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all by 2030). The project contributed significantly to strengthening the national policy dialogue on road safety in each country, ensuring a broad level of participation of the various stakeholders. Furthermore, the RSPRs

---

<sup>16</sup>In Spanish: Instituto Nacional de Tránsito y Transporte Terrestre (INTRANT)

recommendations has led to policy related actions, inter alia updates of the national strategic documents and national legislation; as well as, road safety activities in beneficiary countries, inter alia in GE National Road Safety Action Plans (2017 and 2018) were adopted based on the RSPR recommendations. The RSPR supported the reintroduction of periodic technical inspections for passenger vehicles, firmer standards in import of second-hand vehicles and the adoption of amendments on road safety legislation. In DOM, the project contributed to work moving forward on the Mobility, Ground Transportation, Transit and Road Safety Act (Act No. 63-17) that was pending in the Parliament for years, due to the lack of political consensus. The project contributed to the elaboration of several parts of the above-mentioned law.<sup>17</sup>

There are different aspects of sustainability to be considered at the project level and need to be taken into account while proceeding with development of the sustainability plan (refer to 9.1). In addition, the project has contributed to ECE internal learning, as the methodology utilized in the project was used in the development of the RSPRs in Cameroon and Uganda (initiated in 2017 by the UN SG Envoy for Road Safety).

***(9.1) The sustainability plan was not integrated into the design and implementation of the project.*** The sustainability aspect was addressed, generally, in the project document referring to the inclusion of realistic road safety measures to contribute to the achievement of the UN Decade of Action for Road Safety goals. The approaches were defined and included assessing the possibility to establish a national road safety management system; enacting legislation on key risk factors and acceding to UN road safety legal instruments; setting the indicators against which progress can be measured; and improving the quality of road safety statistics and data. The project document stipulated that RSPR will tackle analyses of implementation of UN road safety related legal instruments<sup>18</sup>, as such addressing, as well, the sustainability at the policy level.

***(10) The likelihood of the stakeholders' engagement in the beneficiary country is high after project completion,*** all 28 interviewed stakeholders expressed their readiness to be further engaged in continuation of the road safety related work (refer to Annex5 List of Interviewees). The ECE has already invested in planning a road safety workshop for SPECA countries in

---

<sup>17</sup> For detailed information about the policy level initiatives refer to the project final report.

<sup>18</sup> Including 1968 Convention on Road Traffic, the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals, the 1970 European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles engaged in International Road Transport, the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road, the 1958 Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted to/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of these Prescriptions, the 1998 Agreement concerning the Establishing of Global Technical Regulations for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or used on Wheeled Vehicles, and the 1997 Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions for Periodical Technical Inspections of Wheeled Vehicles and the Reciprocal Recognition of such Inspections.



Georgia, where RSPR methodology and results will be presented; representatives from AL and GE will be invited to present project results and follow-up activities. The workshop will be financed through RPTC budget. Furthermore, as part of Safe FITS pilot project, international experts will analyze RSPR recommendations and its potential results in Albania and Georgia.

***(10.1) Ownership appears high among project stakeholders and should continue upon project accomplishment.*** The beneficiaries recognize the value of this intervention, as the appreciation towards the project was stated by all (28) interviewed stakeholders and survey respondents provided such appreciated reference in respond to the question of additional comments. Project methodology was based on the participatory approach, as the Regional Commissions interacted with the project stakeholders including governmental officials, as such creating enabling environment. The project approach to identify the road safety National Focal Points of each beneficiary country was strategic and allowed advancement of the ownership at the government level, continued dialog at the policy level among project stakeholders as well was a crucial indication for strengthening cooperation, endorsement of the RSPR and further commitment. Moreover, inclusion of the national experts in the RSPR development process strengthened ownership. In beneficiary countries (particularly GE and DOM), the political will to utilize the RSPR recommendations, in defining future road safety activities and measures, is perceptible. The project was entirely embedded in the institutional national structure relating to road safety in each beneficiary country. Though, financial consideration is an issue, all the interviewed stakeholders reflected on the need for further technical and financial support to address implementation of the recommendations stipulated in the RSPR.

***(11) The project contributed to capacity building; however, the key national road safety institutions are moderately ready to take over the project results;*** there is still need to advance their capacity to adequately sustain the project results specifically pertaining to the technical assistance to support to the institutional road safety management processes, As already stated more comprehensive and integrated approach to capacity building should be utilized based on the capacity development framework (refer to section 11.2) and all aspects of sustainability (refer to section 9) should be taken into account to ensure that the national safety institutions are ready to take over the project results.

Some of the interviewed stakeholders stated the road safety institutions requires further capacity building processes to comprehensively address the capacity needs and constrains at the national level. According to the survey results 18,18% respondents strongly agreed, 43,18% agreed, 18,18% neither agreed nor disagreed and 9,09% disagreed that relevant national organizations have capacities required to sustain the project results (refer to Annex 8 Survey Analyses).

***(11.1) Capacity building processes were in place; non-conventional along with conventional, approaches were applied.*** The project offered several capacity building tools including technically focused meetings (fact findings missions), workshops, training, seminars<sup>19</sup>. One of

---

<sup>19</sup> E/ECE/1447/Add.2. The Capacity-building workshops, seminars, study tours and training courses are

the creative project capacity building approaches, that have been utilized, was identification of champions (national focal points), which lend the project support and, also, engagement of the local consultants to lead the process of RSPR development. Continues consultations with and engagement of national counterparts, have been proceeded with and this constitutes one of the successful capacity building approaches, which contributed to strengthening national institutions' ownership. (refer to section 10.1) Still, the capacity building approaches and processes offered in the scope of this project should be a part of comprehensive capacity building strategy embodied in the national structure of beneficiary countries (refer to section 11.2).

*(11.2) In this intervention the capacity development support entailed skills, work processes, tools and management.* As already stipulated (refer to section 10.1), the beneficiaries highly recognized the value of this intervention; and underlined the need to obtain more comprehensive practices to the capacity building as well as ensure alignment with the interventions carried out by other donors/stakeholders (EU, WB). The project definitely contributed to the reinforcement of the technical capacity in the road safety management system of the beneficiary countries.

According to the survey results 31,82 respondents strongly agreed and 43,18 agreed that the national capacity to identify the priority needs in road safety have been enhanced by the project (accomplishment 1); furthermore, 20,45% survey respondents strongly agreed and 45,45 agree that the capacity to improve road safety have been enhanced. (refer to the section4)

Though, the capacity building processes require a more comprehensive approach to ensure adequate sustainability. The capacity building events should not be stand alone, one-off interventions. The project, indeed provided new skills and competences to respond to the specific needs of the target groups (individual and institutional), but has not define a sustainability plan, which would further incentivize newly acquired skills and lead to improvement of performance in road safety domain. Within the scope of the project the learning strategies could be developed in order to address future training needs in defined areas; and, as well, to proceed with personnel development processes, an imperative to improve institutional capacity and performance. This strategy would ensure embedment of the capacity building practices in the institutional environment and the national level follow up action would be part of the process. The expected results of this project oscillate around utilizing local/national resources (including people, skills, technologies, institutions) and builds on these; still the aspect of accountability requires further attention, mainly because it is directly aligned with leadership (ability to influence) and knowledge. In capacity building processes, it is imperative to set an accountability mechanism when right holders are able to make duty bearers deliver on their obligations. More specifically, it is about the willingness and

abilities of the national public institutions to set such systems to engage citizen groups, capture and utilize their feedback, as well as, capacities of the latter to make use of such accountability platforms. Majority of the interviewers mentioned the need to set an accountability mechanism as a major part of the road safety management system.

#### Summary of findings – Project Sustainability

- \*\* The project results will continue after the completion of the project in all beneficiary countries.
- \*\*The likelihood of the stakeholders' engagement in the beneficiary country is high after project completion.
- \*\*Ownership appears high among project stakeholders and should continue upon project accomplishment.
- \*\*The project contributed to capacity building; however, the key national road safety institutions are moderately ready to take over the project results.
- \*\* The Capacity development processes involved skills work, processes, tools and management; and the project applied non-conventional and conventional capacity building methods.

Despite the fact that there is a probability of continuation of the project results in all beneficiary countries, the high likelihood of the stakeholders' engagement after project completion, high project ownership among project stakeholders; still the key national road safety institutions are relatively ready to take over the project results the project sustainability is rated as moderated.

**The project sustainability is rated MODERATE.**

## 4. Conclusions and recommendations

Across the defined evaluation questions, results were positive at the rate of excellent, overall, with regards to responses to the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, while moderate towards programme design (in the relevance section) and sustainability.

### Conclusions

There are areas that constitute valuable lesson learned to be taken into consideration in future programming and aspects that need to be taken into consideration to advance future programming. The evaluation resulted in the following conclusions:

#### \*\*Project Design

##### 1. Relevance and project design

At the Relevance level: The intervention was an important and essential road safety initiative for all Regional Commissions and other project stakeholders, including governmental counterparts; aligned with the objectives of all counterpart involved.

At the Design level: The Regional Commission teams have developed the project concept based on the UNDA application template. There are particular shortfalls pertaining to the completeness of the template; these pertains to overall objective, indicators at the objective level, sustainability and cross cutting issues including gender. Moreover, in the capacity building programming further attention should be given to development of indicators as a strategic source for capacity building measurement and/or consideration of more comprehensive approach towards capacity building processes including development of capacity building framework.

#### \*\*Project Implementation

##### 2. Effectiveness and efficiency

At the Effectiveness level: The project achieved quality expected accomplishments and requested an extension as an outstanding intervention, due to the saving and opportunity to further the project impact. The Regional Commissions established of sound collaboration with the relevant national stakeholders, which contributed to the accomplishment of expected results and guaranteed that the objective of the project had remained relevant throughout its implementation. The project made a sound contribution to strengthening national capacities, with regards to road safety management system. It provided a solid basis upon which to frame the cooperation and initiate dialogue on advancing road safety performance in beneficiary countries.

At the Efficiency level: Efficiency is considered as one of the strengths of this intervention. The project resources have been efficiently managed and delivered, due to noteworthy management of the ECE as a lead partner of the project, along with the highly responsive other Regional Commissions. The project management was supported, as well, by the Project Management Unit and this contribution added value to the optimization of the project management cycle processes, including proposal development, monitoring and reporting

exercises. The substantial strength pertained to transparent communication and high receptiveness of the ECE as a project lead partner, constructive feedback towards the Regional Commissions' management cycle requirements and the mitigation of challenges through reliable risk management.

## **\*\*Sustainability**

### **3. Sustainability**

At the Sustainability level: There is merit for the future programming in enhancing the sustainability aspect and focus on a more comprehensive approach to capacity building processes through the development of a capacity building strategic framework. The consultant considers that the ECE and Regional Commissions should build on lesson learned from this project and actively seek to secure financial resources. Donor funding should be pursued, specifically to address the need to invest further in capacity building and not to lose the momentum, when relevant national counterparts are keen and ready to undertake further activities related to advancement of the road safety management system in respective countries. Moreover, with the condition that the recommendations of the evaluation are addressed, the project can be replicated in other countries, which fulfill the criteria contingent on the road safety performance relevant context.

The overall final evaluation conclusions are that the project was a significant and valuable capacity building initiative and that the support to beneficiary countries should be continued. There are strategic issues identified that need to be taken into consideration in order to refine capacity building approaches in future programming.

**Key lessons learned and best practices** to be considered for utilization in the future programming:

- Engage beneficiary countries in the process since its commencements, ensure their commitment through an official communication (request from the targeted countries to the relevant Regional Commissions to take a part in the project);
- Conduct comprehensive fact-finding missions to explore further country needs;
- Cooperate closely and consult with the Regional Commissions taking part in the project;
- Identify best practices to promote UN road safety legal instruments and operational tools;
- Apply a high level of integration of different stakeholders during the policy level consultation;
- Engage wide range of national stakeholders including NGOs and other counterparts addressing road safety issues;
- Engage media in the process; ensure their better receptiveness and interest to reflect adequately on road safety issues;
- Explore on synergies, pursue support of beneficiary countries and other organizations to broaden the project impact through investment in additional activities;
- Ensure cross-sectorial approach between infrastructure, mobility, and road safety;
- Utilize non-conventional capacity building approaches including identification of champions (national focal points), and, engagement of the local consultants to lead the process of RSPR development.

### Recommendations

Based on the evaluation findings, it is highly recommended to consider the below indications for future programming:

#### **\*\*Project Design**

##### **Evaluation Criteria – Relevance including project design**

- 1) UNDA to consider inclusion, in the proposal template, of the following sections: overall objective at the impact level with the requirement of insertion indicators of achievements; cross cutting issues and specifically gender-sensitive aspects;
- 2) Regional Commission/s to consider drafting sustainability strategy and/or plan based on sustainability analysis; either during the design stage or as one of the activities within the project timeline. The sustainability strategy should define the governmental/national institutions' goals, there should be an identification of the people, roles and departments that will be responsible for leading the sustainability efforts.

#### **\*\*Project Implementation**

##### **Evaluation Criteria - Efficiency**

- 3) Regional Commission/s (with the participation of the project stakeholders) to draft communication plan/tools, which adequately address internal and external communication at each level (project management inter-Regional Commissions communication, national project stakeholders, beneficiary countries, donors);

#### **\*\*Sustainability**

##### **Evaluation Criteria – Sustainability**

- 4) Regional Commission/s (with the participation of the project stakeholders) to develop a comprehensive approach towards capacity building based on the capacity building development framework.
- 5) Regional Commissions to continue engagement with national stakeholders, donor and financial institutions to ensure proper utilization of the RSPR documents in beneficiary countries, advance the result of the programming, progress national capacity road safety management system, further implementation of the project results and progress in strengthening of the national road safety management system.



## Terms of Reference

### **Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project “Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition”**

#### **I. Purpose**

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the implementation and assess the extent to which the objectives of the UNDA 9 Tranche project “Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition” (hereinafter “Project”) were achieved. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project in strengthening the national road safety management capacities of the beneficiary countries. The results of the evaluation will support improvement of the future technical cooperation projects and activities implemented by UNECE, and in particular, activities which are global in nature (involving several regions and cooperation with several Regional Commissions).

#### **II. Scope**

The evaluation will be guided by the objectives, indicators of achievement and means of verification established in the logical framework of the project document. The evaluation will consider the extent to which the project strengthened capacities of the beneficiary countries (Albania, Georgia, Dominican Republic, and Viet Nam) to improve national road safety management. The evaluation will cover the full period of implementation from 2015 to 2018.

#### **III. Background**

Road safety is an important sustainable development goal, yet relatively underappreciated and greatly underfunded. According to the WHO 2013 Global Status Report on Road Safety, about 1.24 million road traffic deaths occur annually on the world’s roads, with little change observed since 2007. Approximately 90% of all road crashes now happen in low- and middle-income countries. Road crashes cost an estimated 1% to 5% of GDP in developing countries, undermining efforts to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development. More than half of global deaths are among pedestrians and operators of motorized two-wheeled vehicles and rates are even higher in the world’s poorest regions.

Results of the efficient road safety management, whether expressed in terms of reductions in deaths or injuries, taking the special care on vulnerable road users (e.g. children, pedestrians) or problematic areas (e.g. speed, driving under influence, helmet wearing) are important to demonstrate the country’s ability to cope with road safety problems and improve road safety situation. Limited capacities, financial and human resources, weak statistical capabilities and other pressing economic or social problems led to the fact that only a few low- and middle-income countries started the setting of efficient road safety management systems.

The project aimed to assist countries in addressing their priority road safety needs by improving their national road safety management systems. The most critical road safety needs were identified and addressed in the Road Safety Performance Reviews (RSPR) with the aim of improving road safety system. Doing that, countries showed an understanding of national road safety problems and expressed their intent to reduce the number of road deaths and injuries. On the basis of priority needs identified in the Reviews, capacity building seminars and workshops with examples of good road safety practices were prepared and implemented. Furthermore, project aims to help countries to raise



public awareness on road safety issues and sensitize public and non-governmental sector on the need to set ambitious road safety targets and adopt specific measures to meet them. The Project supported better road safety policy-making, contributing to both road-safety related Sustainable Development Goal targets: Target 3.6 (halve the global number of deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents by 2020) and Target 11.2 (provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all by 2030).

The project, financed from 9th the United Nations Development Account (UNDA) Tranche, aimed to assist four developing countries and countries with economies in transition to effectively address and improve national road safety records. Project activities were implemented in four low- and/or middle-income countries: the Republic of Albania, the Dominican Republic, Georgia and the Viet Nam. The project was implemented by three United Nations Regional Commissions (RCs): Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), Economic Commission for Latin America and Caribbean (ECLAC) and Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). The UNECE Sustainable Transport Division was a leader and project coordinator.

#### **IV. Issues**

The evaluation will answer the following questions:

##### ***Relevance***

1. How relevant was the project to the specific needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries in the area of the road safety management?
2. To what extent was the project related to the UNECE programme of work?
3. To what extent was the project development consistent with global and regional priorities and the programme of work of the UN Regional Commissions?
4. To what extent was the project design and development intervention relevant for meeting the project objective?

##### ***Effectiveness***

5. To what extent were the expected accomplishments of the project achieved?
6. What were the challenges/ obstacles to achieving the project objective and expected accomplishments?

##### ***Efficiency***

7. Did the project achieve its objectives within the anticipated budget and allocation of resources?
8. Were the resources (financial and human) appropriate to the design the project?
9. Were the activities implemented according to the planned timeframe?

##### ***Sustainability***

10. To what extent will the results of the project continue after completion of the project in the beneficiary countries?
11. How is the stakeholders' engagement likely to continue in the beneficiary countries?
12. To what extent the key national road safety institutions are ready to take over and have required capacities to sustain the project results?





## V. Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted on the basis of:

1. A **desk review** of all the relevant documents obtained from project files including:
  - Programmes and materials (presentations, background documents) developed for national and regional workshops as well as lists of participants;
  - Reports of workshops;
  - Project webpage;
  - Road Safety Performance Review reports including the recommendations for improvement of national road safety;
  - Annual interim progress reports (for 2015, 2016 and 2017).
2. An electronic **questionnaire** will be developed by the consultant to assess the perspective of the beneficiary countries, after consultation with UNECE, ECLAC and ESCAP.
3. This questionnaire will be followed by **selected interviews** (methodology to be determined by the evaluator in consultation with UNECE, ECLAC and ESCAP). The interviews will take place via phone and Skype. The UNECE project manager will provide the list and contact details.

The report will summarize the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. An executive summary (max. 2 pages) will summarize the methodology of the evaluation, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.

All material needed for the evaluation, will be provided to the consultant: project document and reports, meeting reports and publications, list of involved experts that can be interviewed by telephone. UNECE, ECLAC and ESCAP will provide support and further explanation by Skype and phone to the evaluator when needed.

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNECE Evaluation Policy.

## VI. Evaluation Schedule

1. Desk review of all documents provided by UNECE to the evaluator (10 April 2018)
2. Delivery of inception report including design of survey (20 April 2018)
3. Feedback on inception report by the project manager (25 April 2018)
4. Launching the survey (1 May 2018)
5. Conducting in-person and telephone interviews (1 May – 10 May 2018)
6. Analysis of collected information (10 - 15 May 2018)
7. Draft report (15 May 2018)
8. Comments back to the evaluator after review by the project manager and the PMU (20 May 2018)
9. Final report (25 May 2018).

## VII. Resources

An independent consultant will be engaged for a period of 40 days to conduct the evaluation, within a budget of USD\$\_\_\_\_. Mr. Nenad Nikolic, the project manager, will manage the evaluation in consultation with the Sustainable Transport Division Director Mr. Yuwei Li. The Programme



Management Unit (PMU) will provide guidance to the Project Manager and evaluator as needed on the evaluation design, methodology and quality assurance of the final draft report.

### **VIII. Intended Use/Next Steps**

The evaluation results will be used in the planning and implementation of future similar projects, in particular global projects involving several UN Regional Commissions.

The findings of the evaluation will inform follow up actions and guide initiatives already started and required to disseminate the knowledge created and enhance its use.

The outcomes of the evaluation will also contribute to the broader lessons learned of the UNDA, by being made available on the project website (UNECE sub-page), as well as submitted to UN DESA in UNHQ.

### **IX. Criteria for Evaluators**

Evaluators should have:

- An advanced university degree or equivalent background in relevant disciplines
- Specialized training in areas such as evaluation, project management, social statistics, advanced statistical research and analysis.
- Demonstrated relevant professional experience in design, management and conduct of evaluation processes with multiple stakeholders, survey design and implementation, and project planning, monitoring and management.
- Demonstrated methodological knowledge of evaluations, including quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis for end-of-cycle project evaluations.
- Fluent in written and spoken English.

Evaluators should declare any conflict of interest to UNECE before embarking on an evaluation project, and at any point where such conflict occurs.

## ANNEX II

### Literature and Documents Consulted

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Inception Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
June 2018

### Literature and Documents Consulted

1. Project document
2. Project Logical Framework

### Strategic Documents

3. UNESCAP - Regional Action Programme for Sustainable Transport Connectivity in Asia and the Pacific, phase I, 2017-2021
4. UNESCAP - Regional Action Programme for Transport Development in Asia and the Pacific, phase II, 2012-2016
5. UNSCAP - Regional Road Safety Goals and Targets for Asia and the Pacific 2016-2020
6. UNECE, Together with UNECE on the road to safety, Cutting road traffic deaths and injuries in half by 2020, 2015
7. UNECE ITC Road Safety Action Plan Goals (2011–2020)
8. UNECE, SDGs and the UN Transport Conventions Under the purview of the UNECE Inland Transport Committee,
9. UNECLAC, Proposed strategic framework for the period 2014-2015
10. UNECLAC, Programme of work and priorities for the period 2018-2019
11. UNDA, Report and Recommendations, Improving Global Road Safety: Setting Regional and National Road Traffic Casualty Reduction Targets, 2010

### Assessment Reports, Monitoring & Reporting

12. Annual Project Report 2015
13. Annual Project Report 2016
14. Final Report for the 9<sup>th</sup> Tranche of the UNDA

### Operational Documents

#### General

15. Project Extension Request, August 2017
16. Consultants' Terms of Reference
17. Project Stakeholders' Terms of Reference

#### Georgia

18. Mission Meeting Notes – Georgia 30<sup>th</sup> November – 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015
19. List of Project Stakeholders, Georgia

#### Albania

20. Mission Meeting Notes – Albania, 19<sup>th</sup> -20<sup>th</sup> November 2015
21. List of Project Stakeholders, Albania

#### Viet Nam

22. Project Preparatory Meeting, 17 March 2017
23. Report - Fact-finding mission for UNDA project on "Strengthening the National road safety management capacities of selected Developing Countries and Countries with Economies in Transition", Hanoi, Viet Nam, 10-12 October 2016

## Literature and Documents Consulted

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Inception Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
June 2018

24. Event Summary: National Capacity Building Workshop on the Implementation of Road Safety Related Legal Instruments – Strengthening National Road Safety Management Capacities, Ha Noi, Viet nam; 12-13 January 2017
25. Event Summary: National Capacity Building Workshop on the Implementation of Road Safety Related Legal Instruments – Strengthening National Road Safety Management Capacities; Ho Chi Minh, Viet nam; 16-17 January 2017
26. Event Summary: Capacity building workshop on road safety audit, Ha Noi, Viet nam; 12-18 June 2017
27. Event Summary: Capacity building workshop on road safety audit; Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam; 19<sup>th</sup> -25<sup>th</sup> June 2017
28. Consultative meeting on the main findings of Viet Nam's Road Safety Performance Review; Ha Noi, Vietnam; 15<sup>th</sup> June 2017
29. Interim Report of Road Safety Performance – Road Safety Audit

## Project Related Documents

30. Road Safety Performance Review, Georgia, 2018
31. Road Safety Performance Review, Albania, 2018
32. Road Safety Performance Review, Dominican Republic, 2018
33. Road Safety Performance Review, Vietnam, 2018

## Other documents

34. Success Stories in Technical Cooperation – Towards 2030; Cooperation “Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition”
35. UNECLAC - Bulletin Facilitation of Transport and Trade in Latin America and the Caribbean - Road safety in Latin America and the Caribbean: recent performance and future challenges – Issue Number 322 – Number 6, 2013
36. UNECLAC - Bulletin Facilitation of Transport and Trade in Latin America and the Caribbean – Performance of Latin and the Caribbean during the first dates of the decade of Action for Road Safety America – Issue Number 342 – Number 6, 2015
37. UNECLAC - Bulletin Facilitation of Transport and Trade in Latin America and the Caribbean – Governance of road safety: outcomes of the expert workshop held in Buenos Aires – Issue Number 355 – Number 3, 2017

## ANNEX III

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 June 2018

### Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Issue/Key/Sub Question		Reference to Survey Question
	<b>Relevance</b>	
1	<p><b>Key:</b> How relevant was the project to the specific needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries in the area of road safety management?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b> 1.1. Did the intervention respond to the needs of the target groups? 1.2. Did the operation support the policy (or its development) of the government and was it in line with existing policy?</p>	1)
2	<p><b>Key:</b> To what extent was the project development consistent with global and regional priorities and the programme of work of the UN Regional Commissions (UNECE/UNESCAP/UNECLAC)?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b> 2.1. Was the project aligned with UNECE/UNESCAP/UNECLAC policy/strategic priorities related to RSM programming?</p>	--
3	<p><b>Key:</b> To what extent was the project design and development intervention relevant for meeting the project objective?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b> 3.1. Was the intervention logic, coherent and correctly stipulated in a logical framework? 3.2. Were the indicators appropriately formulated to monitor and measure project performance? 3.3. Have the relevant stakeholders been actively involved in the design process? 3.4. Was the design sufficiently taking cross-cutting issues into account?</p>	2)
	<b>Effectiveness</b>	
4	<p><b>Key:</b> To what extent were the expected accomplishments of the project achieved?</p>	3) 4) 5)

## Evaluation Questions

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 June 2018

	<p><b>Sub:</b></p> <p>4.1. To what extent has the project objective been achieved? Is this measurable through the indicators?</p> <p>4.2. To what extent has the project contributed to strengthening the national road safety management system capacities of the targeted countries?</p> <p>4.3. Are there any, unexpected, negative/positive effects on the target group which have occurred?</p>	
5	<p><b>Key:</b></p> <p>What were the challenges/obstacles to achieving the project objective and expected accomplishments?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b></p> <p>5.1. To what extend has the project adapted to changing external conditions (risks and assumptions) to ensure the achievement of the outcome and the specific objectives.</p>	--
6	<p><b>Key:</b></p> <p>Did the project achieve its objectives within the anticipated budget and allocation of resources?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b></p> <p>6.1. To what degree were the inputs and resources available on time from all parties involved to implement activities?</p> <p>6.2. Were inputs monitored regularly and by whom, to encourage cost-effective implementation of the activities?</p>	--
7	<p><b>Key:</b></p> <p>Were the resources (financial and human) appropriate to the design the project?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b></p> <p>7.1. How were available resources transformed into the intended outputs, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.</p> <p>7.2. To what extent was project management (at RCs) effective in efficiently governing the project implementation?</p> <p>7.3. Were progress reports produced accurately, on time and in response to the reporting requirements?</p>	6) 7)
	<b>Efficiency</b>	

## Evaluation Questions

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 June 2018

8	<p><b>Key:</b>          Were the activities implemented according to the planned timeframe?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b>          8.1. How well were the activities implemented (as planned)? If there were delays, have the reasons been identified and remedial action taken?          8.2. How well were the outputs achieved? Are they correctly reflected through indicators?          8.3. Was there good communication between project management and other project stakeholders (including target groups, beneficiaries)?</p>	--
<b>Sustainability</b>		
9	<p><b>Key:</b>          To what extent will the results of the project continue after the completion of the project in the beneficiary countries?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b>          9.1. Were sustainability/exit strategy integrated into design and implementation of the project?</p>	--
10	<p><b>Key:</b>          How is the stakeholders' engagement likely to continue in the beneficiary countries?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b>          10.1. What is the level of ownership of the operation by the target group and relevant stakeholders?</p>	8)
11	<p><b>Key:</b>          To what extent are the key national road safety institutions ready to take over, and possess the required capacities to sustain the project results?</p> <p><b>Sub:</b>          12.1. Were the capacity building processes in place to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?          12.2. Did the intervention foresee adequate capacity development support?</p>	9)

## ANNEX IV

### Evaluation Survey Questions

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
June 2018

Dear Mrs./Mr.

#### **Your opinion is important.**

You have been invited to participate in a survey, entitled *Road Safety Performance Review*, which will support the final evaluation of the **Road Safety Performance Review Project** (RCs' Sustainable Transport Division Invitation letter attached).

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the implementation and assess the extent to which the objectives of the Road Safety Performance Review Project were achieved. Your participation in the survey will help the evaluator and project management better understand successful Project achievement. We estimate that it will take **about 5-7 minutes** of your time to complete the questionnaire. RC has taken all reasonable measures to protect your identity and responses. Your participation in this survey is voluntary.

**To complete the survey**, click on the link below:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/UNDARSPR>

Please complete this survey by **31 May 2018**.

For any additional questions feel free to contact the evaluator Dr. Iwona SAFI, e-mail [iwonasafi@hotmail.com](mailto:iwonasafi@hotmail.com)

If you do not want to receive any more reminders, you may email us.

Thank you,

On behalf of the Road Safety Performance Review Project,  
RC's representative



## Evaluation Survey Questions

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
June 2018

### Evaluation Survey Questions

#### Contact Information

Name (non-compulsory)

Institution (required)

Country (required)

Email Address (non-compulsory)

Please list the activities, in which you have participated in the project?

Preparatory, fact finding, final missions.

Country Road Safety Performance Review.

Capacity Building National Workshops to initiate national dialog on the Road Safety Performance Review.

Follow up Capacity Building National Workshop on Road Safety related Legal Instruments.

Survey Question		Reference to Key Questions
	<b>Relevance</b>	
1	<b>In your view, was the Road Safety Performance Review project relevant to your country national priorities?</b> Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree  Comments:	1)
2	<b>In your view, was the project relevant to specific needs of road safety stakeholders?</b> Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree  Comments:	3)
	<b>Effectiveness</b>	
3	<b>In your view, was the objective of the project Strengthen the national road safety management system capacities of targeted country, achieved?</b> Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree  Comment:	4)
4	<b>In your view, has the national capacity to identify the priority needs in road safety been enhanced by the project?</b> Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree  Comments:	4)

## Evaluation Survey Questions

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 June 2018

5	<p>In your view, has the national capacity to improve road safety in your country been enhanced by the project?            Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree</p> <p>Comments:</p>	4)
<b>Efficiency</b>		
6	<p>In your view, was the Road Safety Performance Review produced by the project of high quality?            Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree</p> <p>Comments:</p>	7)
7	<p>In your view, were the Road Safety Capacity Building National Workshops implemented by the project of high quality?            Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree</p> <p>Comments:</p>	7)
<b>Sustainability</b>		
8	<p>In your view, will your organization use the results of the Road Safety Performance Review in your country?            Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree</p> <p>Comments:</p>	10)
9	<p>In your view, your organization has capacities required to sustain the project results?            Strongly Agree/Agree/Neither Agree nor disagree/disagree/Strongly disagree</p> <p>Comments:</p>	11)
<b>General</b>		
10	<p>Please share any additional information, recommendation, lessons learned on this project?</p> <p>Comments:</p>	--

# ANNEX V

## List of interviewees

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
June 2018

## List of Interviewees

### Albania

1. Mr. Nenad Nikolic, Regional Advisor, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
2. Mr. Nikolin Berxhiku, Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy
3. Mr. Arben Dhima, Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy
4. Mr. Mithat Tola, Ministry of Internal Affairs
5. Mr. Fadil Borishi, Ministry of Transport
6. Mr. Astrit Nasufi, Road Transport service
7. Ms. Ariana Hasani, Albanian Road Authority

### Georgia

8. Mr. Nenad Nikolic, Regional Advisor, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
9. Mr. Erekle Kezherashvili, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia
10. Mr. Gela Kvashilava, Partnership for Road Safety
11. Mr. Mikheil Khmaladze, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development
12. Mr. Beka Liluashvili, Ministry of Internal Affairs
13. Ms. Mariam Chikobava, Ministry of Education and Science Georgia
14. Mr. Mzevar Gogilava, Tbilisi City Hall
15. Mr. Hari Kulathuman, European investment Bank
16. Ms. Natalya Stankevich, The World Bank

### Vietnam

17. Mrs. Thanattaporn Rasamit, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
18. Mr. Nguyen Van Thach, Ministry of Transport
19. Mrs. Kieu Thi Diem, Ministry of Transport
20. Mr. Do Minh Trung Ministry of Transport
21. Mr. Do Nguyen Viet Hung, Ministry of Transport
22. Dr. Tran Trunk Hieu, University of Transport Technology
23. Dr. Pham Truong Thang, Consultant

### Dominican Republic

24. Ms. Azhar Jaimurzina, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
25. Mr. Gabriel Pérez Salas, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
26. Mr. Victor Ventura, Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development
27. Mr. Moises Holguin Fundacion Red de la Dignidad
28. José Ignacio Nazif-Muñoz, PhD, McGill Institute for Health and Social Policy

# ANNEX VI

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

### Survey Results Summary and Analyses

1. Survey Overview
2. Survey Process
3. Description of Survey Sample
4. Interpretation of Survey Results and Conclusions
5. Endnotes

Table 1: Evaluation Survey Timeline

Table 2: Activities Participation Breakdown

Table 3: Survey stakeholder's Sample

Table 4: Stakeholder's responses

Table 5: Top Three

Table 6: Top Three

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

### 1. Survey Overview

This report summarizes the results of the evaluation survey conducted within the framework of final evaluation of the project of the United Nations Development Account 9<sup>th</sup> tranche “Strengthening the national road safety management capacities of selected developing countries and countries with economies in transition”. The results of the survey supported the overall evaluation’s purpose, to review the implementation and assess the extent to which the objectives of the Road Safety Performance Review Project were achieved and aided the evaluator and project management to better understand the Project’s achievements.

### 2. Survey Process

The survey was administered by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and supported by the UNECE IT department according to the agreed timeline (table 1: Evaluation Survey Timeline). An invitation to participate in the survey was sent by e-mail by three Regional Commissions (RCs) including UNECE, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNECLAC) and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). The email was supported by a formal letter signed by the RCs representatives. The invitation to respond to the survey questions was addressed to project stakeholders, that took part in the project implementation.

A follow up supported by reminder emails was communicated to encourage stakeholders’ participation and notify all about the survey. The Survey questions have been developed by the consultant and validated by the UNECE evaluation manager through consultation with RCs representatives. The items were designed to evaluate accomplishments in four essential areas: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Sustainability.

Survey Questions (SQs) are summarized in Annex4 Evaluation Survey Questions to Final Evaluation Report. Survey questions were formulated based on the evaluation criteria and linked with the Evaluation Questions; to respond to the ToR requirement, “to assess the perspective of the beneficiary countries, after consultation with UNECE, ECLAC and ESCAP”.

**Table 1: Evaluation Survey Timeline**

Date	Action	Responsible
2 <sup>nd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> May	Design Survey Questions	Consultant
7 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> May	Validate the Survey Questions	RCs
11 <sup>th</sup> May	Review and Finalize the Survey Questions *upon comments from RCs	Consultant
12 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> May	Activate Survey Monkey on Line *UNECE licensed	UNECE *with the consultant support
16 <sup>th</sup> May (GE&AL) 22 <sup>nd</sup> May (VN&DOM)	Launch Survey @ to stakeholders with Survey link	RCs

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

21 <sup>st</sup> May 28 <sup>th</sup> May 1 <sup>st</sup> June	Communicate reminder email @ to stakeholders with Survey link	RCs
31 <sup>st</sup> May (GE&AL) 8 <sup>th</sup> May (VN&DOM)	Close Survey	--
8 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> June (including translation)	Share Survey Data	UNECE
8 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> June	Proceed with Data Analysis	Consultant

### 3. Description of Survey Sample

The survey was addressed to the stakeholders taking part in at least one of the project activity:

1. Preparatory, fact finding, final missions.
2. Country Road Safety Performance Review.
3. Capacity Building National Workshops to initiate national dialog on the Road Safety Performance Review.
4. Follow up Capacity Building National Workshop on Road Safety related Legal Instruments.

Number of stakeholders surveyed and number responded: Of the 120 stakeholders who received the survey, 44 responded for an overall response rate of 36,67%.

**Table 2: Activities Participation Breakdown:**

Activity	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Fact finding missions	20	46,51%
Road Safety Performance Review	30	69,77%
Capacity Building National Workshops on RSPR dialog	28	65,12%
Capacity Building National Workshop on Road Safety related Legal Instruments	19	44,19%

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

**Table 3: Survey Stakeholder's Sample**

Stakeholders Group	Total/per country	Survey Sample/per country	Coverage Total/per country
Beneficiaries/stakeholders participating in project activities	Total:120 A: 30 G: 30 V: 30 RD: 30	Total: 120 A: 30 G: 30 V: 30 RD: 30	100%

### 4. Interpretation of Survey Results and Conclusions

Stakeholders' response rate for the survey was modest and equals 36,67%.

**Table 4: Stakeholder's responses**

	Relevance
1	In your view, was the Road Safety Performance Review project relevant to your country national priorities? Strongly Agree: 21 (47,73%) Agree: 19 (43,18%) Neither Agree nor disagree: 1 (2,27%)  3 skipped the answer
2	In your view, was the project relevant to specific needs of road safety stakeholders? Strongly Agree: 20 (45,45%) Agree: 19 (43,18%) Neither Agree nor disagree: 1 (2,27%) Disagree: 1 (2,27%)  3 skipped the answer
	Effectiveness
3	In your view, was the objective of the project Strengthen the national road safety management system capacities of targeted country, achieved? Strongly Agree: 10 (22,73%) Agree: 24 (54,55%) Neither Agree nor disagree: 3 (6,82%) Disagree: 2 (4,55%) 5 skipped the answer
4	In your view, has the national capacity to identify the priority needs in road safety been enhanced by the project? Strongly Agree: 14 (31,82%) Agree: 19 (43,18%) Neither Agree nor disagree: 4 (9,09%) Disagree: 2 (4,55%)  3 skipped the answer

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

5	<p>In your view, has the national capacity to improve road safety in your country been enhanced by the project?</p> <p>Strongly Agree: 9 (20,45%)          Agree: 20 (45,45%)          Neither Agree nor disagree: 6 (13,64%)</p> <p>5 Skipped the answer</p>
<b>Efficiency</b>	
6	<p>In your view, was the Road Safety Performance Review produced by the project of high quality?</p> <p>Strongly Agree: 12 (27,27%)          Agree: 24 (54,55%)          Neither Agree nor disagree: 1 (2,27%)          Disagree: 2 (4,55%)</p> <p>1 Skipped the answer</p>
7	<p>In your view, were the Road Safety Capacity Building National Workshops implemented by the project of high quality?</p> <p>Strongly Agree: 14 (31,82%)          Agree: 19 (43,18%)          Neither Agree nor disagree: 4 (9,09%)          Disagree: 2 (4,55%)</p> <p>5 Skipped the answer</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	
8	<p>In your view, will your organization use the results of the Road Safety Performance Review in your country?</p> <p>Strongly Agree: 12 (27,2%)          Agree: 22 (50%)          Neither Agree nor disagree: 4 (9,09%)</p> <p>6 Skipped the answer</p>
9	<p>In your view, your organization has capacities required to sustain the project results?</p> <p>Strongly Agree: 8 (18,18%)          Agree: 19 (43,18%)          Neither Agree nor disagree: 8 (18,18%)          Disagree: 4 (9,09%)</p> <p>6 Skipped the answer</p>
<b>General</b>	
10	<p>Please share any additional information, recommendation, lessons learned on this project?</p> <p>There were comments related to appreciation of the stakeholders towards the project, indicating that there is a need to continue the project and obtain further UN support to improve the capacity to implement policies on road safety.</p> <p>Some of the comments provide the recommendations for future programming and these include:</p>



## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
 10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Enhance performance of the system.</li> <li>2) Strengthen capacities of respective road safety related institutions on monitoring and evaluation.</li> <li>3) Use findings of RSPR to design an effective road safety strategy and interventions, strengthen local research and knowledge capacity, promote road safety ownership and accountability, increase enforcement of laws combined with public awareness programs.</li> <li>4) Present the RSPR to wide scope of decision makers to restructure administrative capacities and allocate funds for road safety activities.</li> <li>5) Organize more meeting between countries to share successful experiences.</li> <li>6) Replicate and disseminate the results of the project to many technicians in the transport sector (VN).</li> </ol> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The legal UN instruments has had a good impact on national regulations related to road safety</li> <li>-The project greatly helped national stakeholders to identify the current situation on road safety and identify certain measures that need to be taken to improve these conditions</li> <li>-The workshops organized under the project was very important to openly discuss the prepared document</li> <li>-The project mobilized the attention from wide spectrum stakeholders from different institution</li> <li>-The project has supported the road safety greatly</li> </ul>
--	--

### Findings at Glance

All questions had a majority of positive responses oscillating from 47,73% to 18,18% "strongly agree" and from 54,55% to 43,18% "agree".

6 questions had a minority of negative responses oscillating from 2,27% to 9,09% "disagree".

9 items had neutral responses oscillating from 2,27% to 18,18% "neither agree or disagree".

### Top Three and Bottom Three

#### Top Three

The table below identifies the three top items on which stakeholders scored the highest percent of positive responses (strongly agree and agree)

**Table 5: Top Three**

Relevance
1) In your view, was the Road Safety Performance Review project relevant to your country national priorities?
Strongly Agree: 21 (47,73%)
Agree: 19 (43,18%)
Total: 90,91%

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

2) In your view, was the project relevant to specific needs of road safety stakeholders? Strongly Agree: 20 (45,45%) Agree: 19 (43,18%)  Total: 88,63%
<b>Efficiency</b>
6) In your view, was the Road Safety Performance Review produced by the project of high quality? Strongly Agree: 12 (27,27%) Agree: 24 (54,55%)  Total:81,82%

### Bottom Three

The table below identifies the three bottom items on which stakeholders scored the highest percent negative responses.

**Table 6: Bottom Three**

<b>Sustainability</b>
9) In your view, your organization has capacities required to sustain the project results? Disagree: 4 (9,09%)
<b>Effectiveness (3/4) &amp; Efficiency (5/6/7)</b>
7 Questions were scored at the same level Disagree: 2 (4,55%)

The participation in the survey was modest (36,67 percent of stakeholders invited to take part in survey). With such reserved participation, the results cannot serve as a baseline for assessment of similar future programming, but the results definitely added value to the overall evaluation process. The results can, also, help set the direction for further improvement to the project and/or serve as an indicator for future evaluation survey related exercises.

### 5. Endnotes

The Evaluation Survey Principles, as a part of final project evaluation, are based on the UNECE Evaluation Policy<sup>1</sup> and remain essential (Box 2 The UNECE Evaluation Criteria). It becomes important to distinguish as rigorously as possible, at all stages of the evaluation, between findings (facts), conclusions (interpretation of the facts, drawing on the judgement of the evaluators), and recommendations (reasoned advice based on the evaluation findings and conclusions).

<sup>1</sup> UNECE, Evaluation Policy, October 2014

## Evaluation Survey Results

Evaluation of the UNDA 9<sup>th</sup> tranche project (Road Safety Management)  
**Final Report** submitted to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
10<sup>th</sup> June 2018

The UNECE Evaluation Criteria<sup>2</sup>

- 1) **Relevance:** The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.  
Review and reaffirm the relevance of activities in light of UNECE's broad programme objectives
- 2) **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.  
Assess the effectiveness of activities in achieving expected results;
- 3) **Efficiency:** A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.  
Assess the efficiency with which these activities are implemented;
- 4) **Sustainability:** The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits.  
Assess the extent to which UNECE's work leads to successful and sustained development results.

---

<sup>2</sup> The impact is not a criterion for this evaluation as per Evaluation ToR