

## Annex 1

### Terms of Reference

#### Independent Evaluation of the “Strengthening Road Safety – A partnership to build capacity, drive innovation and deliver meaningful impact” initiative

#### Background

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR’s mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other United Nations stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges.
2. UNITAR’s second Strategic Objective calls to “Promote people’s wellbeing and support equitable representation of countries in global decision-making fora”. The sub-objective SO 2.1 “Promote people’s well-being, including the protection and empowerment of groups that have been marginalized and are vulnerable” focuses broadly on developing people’s well-being, with emphasis on helping individuals acquire knowledge and skills to promote sustainable development.
3. In the specific field of road safety, UNITAR contributes to developing the capacities of government officials and key stakeholders to improve road safety and to assisting UN Member States in achieving the related targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Road Safety Performance Targets. Reflecting on the urgency to build capacity to improve road safety and recognizing that road safety is key to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), UNITAR’s Road Safety Initiative for Cities aims to:
  - Enhance the capacity of government authorities on road safety management;
  - Promote public and private sector’s engagement in initiatives that improve road safety; and
  - Contribute to knowledge exchange and sharing of innovative solutions that improve road safety.
4. Through the Initiative **Strengthening Road Safety – A partnership to build capacity, drive innovation and deliver meaningful impact**, UNITAR with the support of **AB InBev** and in collaboration with academic institutions and other private sector partners aim to contribute to advance road safety targets by:
  - Promoting the implementation of holistic, evidence-based approaches to improve road safety;
  - Exploring and testing how digital transformation can deliver significant Road Safety improvements;
  - Enhancing the capacity of government agencies and municipal authorities to implement road safety interventions;
  - Promoting public-private partnerships, leveraging the UNITAR / AB InBev collaboration as a model of collaboration; and
  - Raising awareness on best practices that advance the 2030 SDG agenda and contribute to achieve road safety related targets.

5. **Phase I (2018-2019)** aimed to implement concrete actions to improve road safety related targets and contribute to advance the SDGs by:
  - Promoting the awareness about road safety with the aim of putting road safety as top priority in the agenda of decision makers and private sector leaders;
  - Scale-up road safety local demonstration projects in targeted countries; and
  - Promote research in road safety, knowledge creation and sharing of practical solutions in the field.
  
6. **Phase II (2020-2021)** is based on three pillars and related activities:
  - Pillar 1: Roll out of the “Management Practices for Safer Roads” Toolkit;
  - Pillar 2: Implementation of road safety city interventions, with a focus on digital innovation; and
  - Pillar 3: Stakeholders engagement and communication.
  
7. The objectives of the phase II partnership are:
  - Proven **implementation of the Road Safety Toolkit** with positive, tangible results;
  - Explore and **test how digital transformation can deliver significant Road Safety improvements;**
  - Promote **public-private partnerships** in support of road safety and the SDG 17, leveraging the UNITAR / AB InBev collaboration as an example of best practice;
  - Enhance the capacity of government agencies and municipal authorities to implement **road safety interventions;**
  - Raise awareness on **best practices** that advance the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and contribute to achieve road safety related targets (SDG 3.6 & SDG 11.2).

To date the partnership has lead interventions in Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, India, Mexico, South Africa, the United States and China.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

8. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the initiative; to identify any problems or challenges that the initiative has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation’s purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the initiative’s improvement and broader organization learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the initiative has performed, but also seek to answer the ‘why’ question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results. The evaluation is also forward-looking to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future phases and focus areas.

### **Scope of the evaluation**

9. The evaluation will cover the 2018-2021 phases (I and II) of the initiative. Although the scope of the evaluation does not include the other components of UNITAR’s road safety related programming since 2016, the evaluator should take the other into account beyond internal coherence related questions and in framing the evaluation’s findings and conclusions. In addition to assessing the results achieved from 2018-2020, the evaluation should also examine the current phase with a view to providing recommendations to inform the remaining period of implementation through December 2021.

## Evaluation criteria

10. The evaluation will assess project performance using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

- **Relevance:** *Is the initiative reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
- **Coherence:** *To what extent is the project coherent with relevant policies on road safety, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?*
- **Effectiveness:** *How effective has the project been in delivering results and in strengthening the capacities of government agencies and municipal authorities on road safety management?*
- **Efficiency:** *To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships with local partners?*
- **Impact:** *What are the cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?*
- **Sustainability:** *To what extent are the project's results likely to be sustained in the long term?*

## Principal evaluation questions

11. The following questions are *suggested* to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible with regard to the project's future orientation.

### **Relevance**

- a. *To what extent is the initiative aligned with the UNITAR strategic framework (2018-2021), the Institute's efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and more specifically in helping Member States to achieve Goal 3 (target 3.6) and 11 (target 11.2), amongst others?*
- b. *To what extent is the initiative aligned with the Pillars of the Decade of Action for Road Safety and the Road Safety Voluntary Performance Targets?*
- c. *How relevant are the objectives and the design of the initiative to the identified capacity needs and priorities of global, national and local beneficiaries?*
- d. *How relevant is the initiative to supporting gender equality and women's empowerment, in addition to other groups made vulnerable?*
- e. *How relevant is the initiative in terms of multi-stakeholder collaboration in support of road safety?*

### **Coherence**

- f. *How well does the initiative complement other road safety efforts of UNITAR programming funded by other donors such as Diageo, the Royal Automobile Club of Spain (RACE), JOIE and Pernod Ricard?*
- g. *How well does the initiative complement other existing road safety policies, programmes and projects by other actors, such as by WHO, the UN Special Envoy for Road Safety and the UN Regional Commissions?*

### **Effectiveness**

- h. *To what extent is the initiative contributing to change behaviour/attitudes and informed decision making in a way that contributes to improve road safety or progress towards it?*
- i. *How effective is the initiative's three pillar structure in achieving the three outcome areas related to toolkits, interventions and stakeholder engagement?*
- j. *How effective is the initiative in engaging public and private actors?*
- k. *To what extent are a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy and the "no one left behind" principle incorporated in the design and implementation of the initiative and more specifically in the selection of direct and indirect beneficiaries and intervention countries?*
- l. *Have the initiative's structure and partnerships been effective?*

### **Efficiency**

- m. *To what extent has the initiative produced outputs in a cost-efficient manner (e.g. in comparison with alternative approaches) or is likely to?*
- n. *Were the initiative's outputs and objectives achieved on time (Phase I) and are on track (Phase II)?*
- o. *How environment-friendly (natural resources) has the initiative been?*
- p. *To what extent has the project collaborated with the host governments in Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, India, Mexico, South Africa, the United States and China)?*
- q. *To what extent has the initiative collaborated with the UN Road Safety Collaboration Group (UNRSC)?*
- r. *To what extent has the initiative created benefits of integrating gender equality (or not), and what were the related costs?*
- s. *How cost effective were the CIFAL centre collaborations and other partners (such as academic institutions and private sector) arrangements?*
- t. *To what extent has the initiative adjusted to the COVID-19 related context?*

### **Likelihood of impact and early indication of impact**

- u. *What observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred from Phase I?*
- v. *To what extent has the initiative contributed to reducing road-safety traffic deaths and injuries by 2020 (SDG 3.6)*
- w. *To what extent is Phase II expected to generate impact, globally and in intervention countries in comparison to non-intervention countries?*
- x. *What real difference does the initiative make in contributing to global road safety efforts?*

### **Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability**

- y. *To what extent are the initiative's results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term?*
- z. *What are the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability, including environmental sustainability, of the initiative?*
- aa. *To what extent is the current design likely to contribute to sustained capacity?*
- bb. *What can we learn from the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic to inform the future design of the road safety programming?*

### **Evaluation Approach and Methods**

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework](#) and the [United Nations norms and standards for evaluation, and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#). The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the "evaluator") under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME).

12. In order to maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process, including the project partners, the UN Country Teams, the participants, the donor and other stakeholders. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; review of the log frame (reconstructed) baseline data and reconstruction of the theory of change; key informant interviews; focus groups; and field visits. These data collection tools are discussed below.
13. It is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:
  - **Individual dimension** relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
  - **Organizational dimension** relates to public and private organizations, civil society organizations, and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level.
  - **Enabling environment dimension** refers to the context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

**Table 1: Capacity areas within the three dimensions**

<b>Individual</b>	Skills levels (technical and managerial skills)	Knowledge
	Competencies	Attitudes, behaviours and values
<b>Organizations</b>	Mandates	Organizational priorities
	Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms	Processes, systems and procedures
	Motivation and incentive systems	Human and financial resources
	Strategic leadership	Knowledge and information sharing
	Inter/intra institutional linkages	Infrastructure
	Programme management	
<b>Enabling environment</b>	Multi-stakeholder processes	
	Policy and legal framework	Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power
	Political commitment and accountability framework	Legal, policy and political environment
	Governance	

14. The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate.

**Data collection methods:**
*Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the project, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex C.

If baseline data available allows for it, the evaluator should consider using [Difference in Difference \(DD\)](#) and [Propensity Score Matching \(PSM\)](#) methodologies for the impact assessment related evaluation questions.

The evaluator should also consider whether [Outcome mapping](#) / [Outcome harvesting](#) are suitable tools for answering the evaluation questions.

*Stakeholder analysis*

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in the project. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:

- Partner institutions, including donors and other partners such as CIFAL centres;
- Beneficiaries/participants;
- App users;
- Trainers/facilitators;
- UN Country Team;

- Host (local and national) governments;
- Academic institutions
- Etc.

#### *Survey(s)*

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

#### *Key informant interviews*

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of contacts is available in Annex A. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, at the national or local level.

#### *Focus groups*

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders at the local levels to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

#### *Field visit*

Due to COVID-19 the data collection does not include a field visit that requires international travel. Local travel for interviews and focus groups with logistical support from Project Management local staff is to be considered depending on the residence of the evaluator. Observation may also prove useful if activities are being implemented simultaneously to the local field visit. The evaluator shall also organise a one-day workshop on [outcome evidencing](#) with project stakeholders remotely if it can add value to the evaluation's data collection.

The evaluator should be able to undertake data collection entirely remotely should travel restrictions be imposed due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

### **Gender and human rights**

15. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender and equity perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other disadvantaged groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on gender equality.
16. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow **ethical** and professional standards([UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#)).

### **Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

17. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from October 2020 (initial desk review and data collection) to February 2021 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
18. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The Evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.
19. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.
20. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex D. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 20-30 pages, excluding annexes.
21. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to the project which is comprised of a member of the project management, a representative of the project global partners, a representative from national partners and a representative from the donor, AB InBev.
22. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to Project Management to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex G by 26 February 2021. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 19 March 2021. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe: October 2020 – March 2021

Activity	October	November	December	January	February	March
Evaluator selected and recruited						
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis						
Evaluation design/question matrix						
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit						
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR						
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management						
Project Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations						
Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management						
Presentation of the evaluation findings and lessons learned						

**Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule**

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	13 November 2020
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	20 November 2020

Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	5 February 2021
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	19 February 2021
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	26 February 2021
Comments on draft report	Project Management	Evaluation manager	12 March 2021
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	19 March 2021
Presentation of the evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Project Management	19 March 2021

### Communication/dissemination of results

23. The evaluation report shall be written in English. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

### Evaluation management arrangements

24. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) ('evaluation manager').
25. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.
26. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g. accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

### Evaluator Ethics

27. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#).

### Professional requirements

28. The evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:
- MA degree or equivalent in transportation, development or a related discipline. Knowledge and experience of executive type training, including in areas related to transportation, transport policy, road safety.
  - At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
  - Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of transport/road safety related topics.
  - Field work experience in developing countries.

- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
- Excellent writing skills.
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in oral and written English.
  
- **Annexes:**
  - A. List of contact points**
  - B. Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**
  - C. List of documents and data to be reviewed**
  - D. Structure of evaluation report**
  - E. Project logical framework**
  - F. Audit trail**
  - G. Evaluator code of conduct**

**Annex A: List of contact points**

**Project Management to complete**

**Estrella Merlos**

[estrella.merlos@unitar.org](mailto:estrella.merlos@unitar.org)

**Angela Montano**

[angela.montano@unitar.org](mailto:angela.montano@unitar.org)

**Evelyn Avalos**

[evelyn.avalos@unitar.org](mailto:evelyn.avalos@unitar.org)

**B: Event data available on the Event Management System from 1.1.2018-27.10.2020**

Admin entity	Start date (Y-m-d)	End date (Y-m-d)	Event title	Learning	Participated
CIFAL	2018-05-28	2018-06-22	CIFAL Madrid - Postgraduate course: "Expert in Road Safety Management and Administration"	L	15
CIFAL	2018-03-13	2018-03-13	CIFAL Madrid - Road Safety Management		46
CIFAL	2018-08-03	2018-09-19	CIFAL Curitiba- Road Show (series)		904
CIFAL	2018-10-16	2018-10-18	CIFAL Madrid- VI Iberoamerican Road Safety Conference		437
CIFAL	2018-10-17	2018-10-17	CIFAL Madrid- Child Road Safety		78
CIFAL	2018-11-13	2018-11-13	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Driving Conference		135
CIFAL	2019-02-20	2019-02-22	CIFAL Madrid- Child & Pregnancy Road Safety Professional Conference		260
SDP / Social Development Programme	2019-04-25	2019-04-26	Road Safety and Digital Innovation		63
SDP / Social Development Programme	2019-03-26	2019-03-28	High-Visibility Enforcement to Reduce Road Traffic Injuries and Fatalities related to Drivers Using Alcohol	L	29
SDP / Social Development Programme	2019-02-16	2019-02-16	Road Safety Conference: Africa		95
SDP / Social Development Programme	2019-04-03	2019-04-04	Child Road Safety in the Dominican Republic		84

CIFAL	2019-05-06	2019-05-06	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Driving Course	NL	79
CIFAL	2019-05-07	2019-05-07	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Education is everybody's business at Alarcon, Madrid		280
CIFAL	2019-05-08	2019-05-08	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Education is everybody's business at Almeria		326
CIFAL	2019-05-09	2019-05-09	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Education is everybody's business at Sanxenxo		460
CIFAL	2019-05-10	2019-05-10	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Education is everybody's business at Andalucia		530
SDP / Social Development Programme	2019-08-07	2019-08-08	Road Safety International Conference		137
CIFAL	2019-04-03	2019-04-03	CIFAL Madrid- Child Road Safety (Conference)		134
CIFAL	2019-05-27	2019-06-21	CIFAL Madrid- Postgraduate course: Expert in Road Safety Management and Administration	L	15
CIFAL	2019-06-25	2019-06-25	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety Training in Prisons	NL	98
CIFAL	2019-09-18	2019-09-19	CIFAL Madrid- III Iberoamerican Road Safety Congress – InterCISEV		260
CIFAL	2019-09-25	2019-09-25	CIFAL Madrid- European Project on Road Safety		35
CIFAL	2019-08-20	2019-09-19	CIFAL Curitiba- Road Show (series)		410
CIFAL	2019-10-08	2019-10-08	CIFAL Madrid- International congress on road safety		147
CIFAL	2019-10-19	2019-10-19	CIFAL Madrid- Education on Child Road Safety		82
CIFAL	2020-06-17	2020-06-17	Management Practices for Safer Roads	NL	305
CIFAL	2020-09-23	2020-09-23	Management Practices for Safer Roads		87
CIFAL	2020-01-28	2020-01-28	CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety and Children		23

---

<b>CIFAL</b>	<b>2020-01-25</b>	<b>2020-01-25</b>	<b>CIFAL Madrid- Road Safety and Youth</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>Total</b>					<b>5,562</b>

### Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Annual narrative and finance reports
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Project Description
- UN Road Safety Resolutions:  
<https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/74/299>  
[https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/72/271&referer=/english/&Lang=E](https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/72/271&referer=/english/&Lang=E)
- UN Road safety conventions and global frameworks:  
[http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/road\\_Safety/Publications/United\\_Nations\\_Road\\_Safety\\_Conventions\\_01.pdf](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/road_Safety/Publications/United_Nations_Road_Safety_Conventions_01.pdf)  
[https://www.who.int/roadsafety/decade\\_of\\_action/plan/en/](https://www.who.int/roadsafety/decade_of_action/plan/en/)  
[https://www.who.int/violence\\_injury\\_prevention/road\\_traffic/12GlobalRoadSafetyTargets.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/road_traffic/12GlobalRoadSafetyTargets.pdf?ua=1)
- UN Secretary General Reports on Road Safety:  
<https://www.who.int/roadsafety/about/resolutions/download/A-74-304-EN.pdf?ua=1>
- Special Envoy for Road Safety:  
<http://www.unece.org/un-sgs-special-envoy-for-road-safety/un-sgs-special-envoy-for-road-safety.html>  
[http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/roadsafe/publications/UN\\_SE\\_brochure.pdf](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/roadsafe/publications/UN_SE_brochure.pdf)  
[https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2017/wp1/UNSG\\_Report\\_72-359\\_en.pdf](https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2017/wp1/UNSG_Report_72-359_en.pdf)
- Brochure:  
[https://unitar.org/sites/default/files/media/file/Road%20Safety%20Global%20Training%20Initiative\\_brochure\\_0.pdf](https://unitar.org/sites/default/files/media/file/Road%20Safety%20Global%20Training%20Initiative_brochure_0.pdf)
- Learning platform: <https://www.un-roadsafety-learn.org/>
- Content from events: <https://www.unitar.org/about/news-stories/news/using-digital-innovation-and-technology-advance-road-safety>  
<https://unitar.org/about/news-stories/news/unitar-launches-toolkit-road-safety-management>
- UNITAR website content:  
<https://unitar.org/sustainable-development-goals/people/our-portfolio/road-safety-initiative>  
<https://www.unitar.org/about/news-stories/news/unitar-and-anheuser-busch-inbev-sign-partnership-agreement-collaborate-road-safety>  
<https://www.unitar.org/about/news-stories/news/unitar-continues-promote-road-safety-through-multi-stakeholder-partnerships>  
<https://unitar.org/sustainable-development-goals/people/our-portfolio/road-safety-initiative>
- Press release: [https://www.unitar.org/sites/default/files/uploads/2018-CIFAL/press\\_release\\_unitar\\_abinbev\\_final\\_feb14.pdf](https://www.unitar.org/sites/default/files/uploads/2018-CIFAL/press_release_unitar_abinbev_final_feb14.pdf)
- AB InBev website content:  
<https://www.ab-inbev.com/what-we-do/road-safety.html>  
<https://ab-inbev.eu/news/today-ab-inbev-signed-a-partnership-agreement-with-the-un-to-collaborate-to-improve-road-safety/>
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

## **Annex D: Structure of evaluation report**

- i. Title page
- ii. Executive summary
- iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Project description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
  - a. Terms of reference
  - b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
  - c. List of persons interviewed
  - d. List of documents reviewed
  - e. Evaluation question matrix
  - f. Evaluation consultant agreement form

## Annex E: Project Logical Framework and outcome areas

### Pillar 1: Roll out of the “Management Practices for Safer Roads” Toolkit

Planned Outcome 1	Indicators and performance measures			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Roll out of the “Management Practices for Safer Roads” Toolkit	Number of beneficiaries reached	0	160'000		
Outputs	Indicators and performance measures			Means of verification	Assumptions
1.1. Development of a mobile App	Number of people downloading the App		10'000	Track app download	
1.2. Delivery of 15 webinars about the Toolkit	Number of participants		450	List of participants	30 participants per webinar
1.3. Disseminate the Toolkit through the CIFAL Global Network events, beneficiaries, and respective websites	Promotion of Toolkit throughout CIFAL events in 2020-2021		150'000	List of participants and list of events	
1.4 Promote the Toolkit through (10) workshops and (10) webinars delivered by the CIFAL Centres	Number of stakeholders taking part in the workshops and webinars		600	List of participants	30 participants per webinar and workshop
1.5. Content enhancement - Translation of the Toolkit into Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Hindi	Toolkit translated and integrated into the E-learning platform		4	Toolkit integrated into Virtual Learning Environment	

1.6. Content enhancement - Inclusion of ABI internal toolkits and other best practices	Additional toolkits integrated into Road Safety Toolkit and update/inclusion of best practices			ABI toolkits integrated into Virtual Learning Environment	
<b>Project activities/milestones</b>				Planned scheduled timeframe	
Preparation phase				December 2019 - March 2020	
Delivery phase				April 2020 - November 2021	

## Pillar 2: Implementation of road safety city interventions

Planned Outcome 2	Indicators and performance measures			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Implementation of road safety city interventions	Number of local projects implemented	0	2	Projects in progress	
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Indicators and performance measures</b>			<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
Implementation of 2 road safety city interventions in targeted countries: Shanghai, China; 1 city in Africa or the Americas region	Number of local projects implemented		2	Projects in progress and/or fully implemented	
<b>Project activities/milestones</b>				Planned scheduled timeframe	
Preparation phase				December 2019 - April 2020	
Delivery phase				May 2020 - November 2021	

## Pillar 3: Stakeholders engagement and communication

Planned Outcome 3	Indicators and performance measures			Means of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Stakeholders engagement and communication - Sharing of knowledge and practical solutions in road safety	Number of stakeholders joining the Partnership for Action and sharing content	0	10	List of confirmed partners	
Outputs	Indicators and performance measures			Means of verification	Assumptions
1.1. Implementation of 4 half-day stakeholders dialogues with selected government officials and industry leaders	Number of relevant stakeholders participating		100	List of participants	25 by-invitation only participants
1.2. Participation in 10 major regional/global conferences	Number of participants reached through the participation in 10 major conferences		15'000	Event's agenda including AB InBev participation	
1.3. Development of partnerships that support the Road Safety Learning and Partnership Platform through best practices and innovative solutions	Number of partners joining the Partnership for Action and RS platform		10	List of partners confirmed	
1.4 Online training course on Social Norms	Number of participants taking the course		140	List of participants	35 participants per session. 2 sessions per year

1.5 Creation of Advisory Committee on "social norms"	Members invited and confirmed		5	List of active members	
<b>Project activities/milestones</b>				Planned scheduled timeframe	
Preparation phase				January 2020 - April 2020	
Delivery phase				May 2020 - November 2021	



## Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form\*

### The evaluator:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

\*This form is required to be signed by each evaluator involved in the evaluation.

<sup>1</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)