



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
EuropeAid Co-operation Office

General affairs

**Evaluation**

I:\Carpedo Evaluations\Evaluation Transport\2. TORs\final.doc

**15/12/04 10:54:45**

**EVALUATION OF TRANSPORT SECTOR  
INTERVENTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE  
EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN THIRD COUNTRIES**

**FINAL TERMS OF REFERENCE**

May 2002

Final

# **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A THEMATIC EVALUATION OF TRANSPORT SECTOR INTERVENTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION IN THIRD COUNTRIES**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. Mandate**

During its meeting of 29 November 2001, the Board of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office requested the Evaluation Unit to undertake an evaluation of interventions in the transport sector.

### **1.2. Background**

Expenditure by the European Commission on transport accounted for around €2.5 billion in the period 1995-2000 in the ACP, Asia, Latin America, Mediterranean, Balkans and Newly Independent States. To this figure can be added the contribution of loan financing from the European Investment Bank.

Since the early 1990s there has been a progressive shift from a project-based approach towards support to sector-wide strategies as the most appropriate way to help sustainable development in the transport sector. Thus, in an Evaluation of the Transport Sector in ACP countries (1993), there were recommendations for transport policies to be consistent with policies in other sectors. There was also an emphasis on applying greater rigour, particularly in the early stages of the project cycle, and a clearly stated need for future projects to take a wider sectoral policy view and for projects themselves to have a sectoral character and to address policy reform.

The continuing importance of the sector within the Commission's global development strategy, and in promoting economic regeneration in areas such as the Western Balkans and the Newly Independent States, merits periodic appreciation, particularly as the technological and environmental context is subject to constant evolution. Of great importance also is the increased focus on poverty reduction. Commitment and ownership by recipient countries, within a framework of enhanced policy dialogue, have been strongly encouraged.

In its Communication of 2000 on Development Policy, the Commission reaffirmed the importance of transport as a priority area for intervention. It was stressed that reliable and sustainable transport plays a key role in access to basic social services, and that sectoral policies in transport are necessary to make it sustainable, and to keep it balanced in terms of social, economic and environmental requirements. With this in mind, an analysis of the relevance and impact of the sector programmes in the previous period should serve to assist in preparing programmes and interventions in the future.

Systematic and timely evaluation of its expenditure programmes has been defined as a priority of the European Commission, as a means of accounting for the management of allocated funds and of promoting a lesson-learning culture throughout the organisation.

### **1.3. Scope of the Evaluation**

The Evaluation is not connected to the revision of a formal legal base such as a Regulation. However, it has been requested in the context of a need for systematic periodic assessment of major financial interventions, and in the light of the fact that no global evaluation of the sector in the main beneficiary regions has been undertaken for seven years. An evaluation of the sector is further merited by the introduction of reforms in both country and regional strategy programming and in aid delivery.

The Consultant will begin by reviewing the evolution of the Commission's policy as regards development and external co-operation in the transport sector since 1995. This review will be based upon Commission policy statements, sector guidelines, instructions on programming and on the design of sector interventions, and the results of relevant evaluations undertaken in the sector, and will require the definition of any major differences in approach between different regional programmes. From this analysis, the consultant will proceed to an evaluation of the Commission's actions in the field of transport in ACP countries and in the regions covered by the regulations TACIS, ALA, MEDA and CARDS. The Consultant will give a response to the Evaluation Questions listed in section 3 below. This evaluation will focus on the period 1995-2001, since the last major evaluation of the sector.<sup>1</sup>

For the purpose of the evaluation, "transport" refers to infrastructure, services, traffic management and regulatory activities for all modes – road, rail, aviation, maritime and inland waterways/combined transport. This evaluation is not directly concerned with international negotiations in fields such as satellite navigation and the opening up of airspace or airport landing slots, except insofar as these matters are shown to be linked to the achievement of fundamental development objectives.

The evaluation is not intended to replace present or future evaluations under the regulations covering the regions under scrutiny (TACIS, ALA, MEDA, ACP and CARDS), and which may devote some attention to transport questions.

#### **1.4. Evaluation Users**

The evaluation should serve policy and sectoral decision-making and project management purposes. This requires addressing the principal concerns of the Board of Commissioners of the RELEX family, as well as those relevant to the RELEX family services. DGs DEV, RELEX, AIDCO and TREN, and EC Delegations in the countries covered by this exercise will thus be the main users of the Evaluation. However, the evaluation should also generate results of interest to an audience that would include geographical desks and those responsible for intervention in other sectors (for example, food security, health or education), as well as governmental and civil society partners.

#### **1.5. Purpose and results of the evaluation**

The primary **purpose** of the present evaluation is to achieve **improved coherence and application of the Commission's sectoral approach to transport in partner countries**. To achieve this purpose, the evaluation should assess the European Commission's co-operation activities in the transport sector, relative to the general and specific objectives of the different regional co-operation and development programmes, and in particular the extent to which the Commission's sectoral approach has been adopted in practice and has proved appropriate.

The evaluation should be built around a testing and verification of the logic and consistency of individual actions against stated objectives and anticipated impacts. It should also aim at enhancing coherence between objectives in the field of transport and the Commission's other objectives, as well as a more rational strategic decision-making (including within Country Strategy Papers).

The main **results** of the evaluation will be assessments of key issues reflected in the Evaluation Questions set out below in section 3. These issues include the quality and impact of transport policy dialogue and accompanying policy actions; the impact of Commission

---

<sup>1</sup> If necessary, the consultants will take into consideration actions, strategy documents and legal bases elaborated before 1995 if these are still considered relevant for the period under study.

assistance in relation to economic and social development goals; the coherence and complementarity of EC assistance with other EU policies; the degree of attention given to cross-cutting and horizontal issues, and the relevance and efficiency of tools, working practices and financial mechanisms.

As part of its function, the evaluation should come to a general overall judgement on the Commission's past performance and the relevance of its current approach to programme design. However, this judgement should be based upon well-founded conclusions regarding the fundamental aspects of the Commission's approach in the sector. The final report should contain findings and recommendations expressed clearly enough to be translatable into operational terms by the Commission.

## 2. BASIC ELEMENTS

The evaluation must lead to a set of conclusions (based on findings) and to related recommendations. The assessment will be based on five key evaluation criteria: impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and the approach should encompass the following fundamental tasks:

- i. identify, explain and hierarchise the Commission's objectives in the field of transport, their logic and coherence, their **relevance** both to EU objectives and to the needs of recipient countries, the intended **impact**<sup>2</sup> corresponding to each objective, and finally how these intended impacts fit within broader and changing contexts (sociological, cultural, economic, political).
- ii. identify all recorded impacts including unintended impacts or deadweight/substitution effects (and compare them to intended impacts); assess **effectiveness** in terms of how far the intended results were achieved and also - to the extent that the interventions were effective - their **efficiency** in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed to, or hindered the achievement of results;
- iii. consider the **sustainability** of transport activities, that is an assessment of whether key results, taking account in particular of the institutional capacity required to maintain consistent levels of access and service delivery;
- iv. assess how far the development and delivery of transport programmes has taken account of **crosscutting issues** (environment, gender, capacity-building, etc.), on the one hand, and of co-ordination, complementarity and coherence aspects on the other.

## 3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

### Introduction

A number of specific evaluation questions have been elaborated, and as explained below the evaluation team is expected fully to address each one insofar as it can. These questions serve firstly as a way of articulating the key common demands of interested services, and secondly as a means of ensuring that the full extent of stated objectives, obligations and activities in the sector is not neglected. The use of questions is also intended to facilitate the organisation

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note the ordering of the five criteria. In the context of the programmes of the External Relations Directorates-General, the increased focus on *impact* is of particular importance given the current emphasis on results-based management as well as on partner Governments to focus their policies more on poverty alleviation, good governance, democracy, and sound macroeconomic management.

of discussions and communications between the evaluators and stakeholders. Thus *the following questions reflect the Commission's principal fields of interest at the time of commissioning the evaluation:*

### **A. The Evolution and Impact of Transport Policy in Partnership**

- 1. To what extent were policy and programme development (at a sectoral level) conducted in partnership with third countries since the publication of the last major evaluation, and with what effect?**

Coverage includes:

- \* The degree to which strategies and programmes were designed in a manner relevant to needs and problems identified in partner countries, including those of an institutional nature*
- \* The links which have been identified (or not) at a strategic level between transport and other key sectors, such as education, health and rural development, in establishing a clear place for transport within the overall development strategy of partner countries and regions, and achieving a poverty focus*
- \* Changes in the style and content of dialogue-shaped programme definition and implementation*
- \* The degree to which Commission programmes sought to address the needs of stakeholders outside government*
- \* The quality and use of data in decision-making, and the degree to which it is backed by reliable research*

- 2. To what extent has policy commitment from partner countries been secured so as to ensure the sustainability of transport strategies?**

Coverage includes:

- \*The degree of commitment to transport sector reform, in line with the Commission's sectoral approach, for example as regards institutional restructuring, commercialisation, cost recovery from infrastructure users and environmental sustainability*
- \* The recognition that investment in transport requires significant government commitment on the public expenditure side and in terms of capacity-building<sup>2</sup>, ensuring a reasonable share of national budgets, sustained funding, and adequate provision for maintenance*
- \* Different approaches to securing commitment in different geographical areas, taking account of the role of Poverty Reduction Strategies where these have been in operation*
- \* The leverage of funding from national sources, for example through technical assistance actions and studies*

## **B. Commission assistance in relation to sustainable economic and social development goals, integration into the world economy, and the campaign against poverty**

### **3. How far have Commission strategies, programmes and projects contributed to the achievement of sustainable economic benefits?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *The facilitation of regional and international trade*
- \* *Direct job creation in the sector, and indirect employment effects where these can be attributed*
- \* *Longer-term sustainable wealth creation where this can be measured*
- \* *The reduction of logistics costs for manufactured goods and the reduction of the price of exported goods*
- \* *Other measurable benefits to transport users*

### **4. How far have Commission strategies, programmes and projects contributed to poverty reduction by improving access to essential services?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *Access to food, water, education, employment, healthcare and other basic provisions, which are essential to the achievement of social development, especially for disadvantaged populations experiencing poverty – this aspect focuses specifically on the degree to which transport serves other sectors (whereas question 1 relates more to the establishment of strategic priority and weight between sectors).*
- \* *In contrast to question 3, this question focuses more on the impacts of the Commission's activities as they affect beneficiaries, rather than users*

### **5. How far have Commission strategies, programmes and projects contributed to economic, and political integration across political and population boundaries?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *Removal of cross-border barriers and elimination of bottlenecks at frontiers*
- \* *Links between regional transport networks and the Trans-European Networks, via "Crete Corridors" and Pan-European Transport Areas*
- \* *The degree to which the Commission has taken account of broader aspects such as trade policy, customs barriers and transport sector liberalisation in designing its interventions and ensuring their relevance.*
- \* *Links between transport actions and other policies to encourage regional co-operation (cultural, educational, economic, labour market etc)*

## **C. Transport Sector Goals**

**6. How far have Commission strategies, programmes and projects contributed to specific sector goals?**

The goals referred to in this question would include:

- \* *financial sustainability through provision for management and maintenance and provision for revenue; better prioritisation of finance for transport modes in public expenditure*
- \* *institution strengthening and capacity-building*
- \* *reduction of public sector dominance, and a reduction in supply-led policies associated with over capacity: allowing transport networks to be adapted to resources*
- \* *compliance with or harmonisation towards international transport standards adopted already by the EU*
- \* *fair competition and rational pricing of services*
- \* *improvements in safety and technical interoperability.*

**D. Horizontal and cross-cutting issues – environment, safety, gender, health,**

**7. To what degree have Commission strategies, programmes and projects contributed to improvements in health and safety, and in environmental impact?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *The use and quality of environmental impact assessment, strategic environmental analysis and other similar disciplines during project and programme formulation. Aspects of modal balance (including removing freight from the roads), updating regulations, the use of non-motorised transport, application of the polluter pays principle, and optimising the use of existing infrastructure (through traffic management measures)*
- \* *Monitoring and surveillance of transport emissions and other environmental impacts (eg on soil and water)*
- \* *Establishment and enforcement of legal standards, design issues, technical innovations and traffic management measures which are aimed at improving safety to passengers, workers, and populations otherwise affected by transport*
- \* *Health and safety issues related to increased mobility, eg the transmission of major diseases (HIV-AIDS, tuberculosis etc)*

**8. How far have strategies, programmes and projects sponsored and funded by the Commission, and the conditions and context of such funding, contributed to ensuring a gender sensitive access to transport services, as well as equal access to members of minority or disadvantaged populations?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *Participation of minority groups and gender sensitivity in programme and project design (distinguishing formalistic and substantive approaches)*

**E. Tools and working practices, financial mechanisms and the programme framework**

**9. To what extent has the design of Commission-sponsored strategies, programmes and activities, especially the choice of beneficiaries, funding instruments and donor mix (including EIB) facilitated the achievement of specific objectives established for the sector?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *Follow-up to recent major evaluations (including those at project level, and those conducted by other donors) covering this aspect*
- \* *To what extent a truly sector-wide approach is being developed in the different geographical regions (taking account of intermodal and multimodal aspects, and the specific challenges of urban development, of remote or peripheral areas, and of landlocked countries with difficult access to port facilities)*
- \* *Whether civil society involvement and other forms of decentralisation have contributed to the achievement of specific objectives*
- \* *The role of the Commission in leading and co-ordinating other sector donors, and in triggering their funds, and the measures taken to ensure complementarity with those donors, especially the World Bank and the EU Member States*
- \* *Whether project definition and appraisal activities are well suited to ensuring that projects meet stated objectives (specific and overall) and are sustainable in the continued delivery of key results. This includes an analysis of the degree and quality of use of project cycle management, economic and financial analysis and logical framework methods as they apply to these activities.*

**10. To what extent has the implementation and delivery by the Commission of support to transport projects facilitated the achievement of objectives, and if so, how has it benefited from the available tools of a sectoral approach?**

Coverage includes:

- \* *The degree of achievement of planned outputs in the sector, including any common factors that may impact on the launching, acceleration or completion of projects, or on the achievement of value for money and additionality in Commission support.*
- \* *The degree to which tools such as those described in the transport sector guidelines (including project cycle management and the logical framework approach) have assisted in achieving objectives on the ground should also be considered, paying special attention to the experiences of practitioners in delegations and partner countries.*

- \* *The quality and use of project-level evaluation, and results-oriented monitoring.*
- \* *Concrete suggestions for areas where thematic groups on transport in the Commission could define further working tools for the sector would also be appropriate.*

***Nota Bene: On the basis of the structuring phase (see below §5.2), the consultants may propose changes to the evaluation questions (cancel some or add new questions if some appeared necessary in order to evaluate all the impacts implied within the objectives set out by the European Commission). However, after validation by the Steering Group, no more than twelve Evaluation Questions in total should be retained.***

## 4. EVALUATION PHASES AND REPORTING

### 4.1. Evaluation Phases

The evaluation will be divided into **two phases** – a Preparatory Phase, mainly devoted to make a preliminary assessment, structuring and preparation of the evaluation approach, and a Completion Phase, including in particular the main field visits and final reporting and synthesis activities.

#### 4.1.1. Preparatory Phase

At the start, the evaluation team will deliver to the Evaluation Unit an **inception note** setting out in full their *understanding* of these Terms of Reference as well as their *proposed approach* to the work in the Preparatory Phase. The Evaluation Unit will determine whether to give its formal agreement to this proposal.

The evaluation team will then examine all relevant key documentation on the past and current Commission actions, considering also interventions by the European Investment Bank in the sector. This material would include data on the relevant Communications, strategy documents and instruments, evaluations, and an analysis based on extensive discussions with Commission officials and the EIB. During this documentary work, the consultants shall also take into consideration the methods that are currently being used by other donors.

With the information obtained the consultants will produce **a draft final report on the Preparatory Phase** to be delivered to the Evaluation Unit. In this document, which focuses to the *structuring* of the evaluation, the consultants will present the intervention logic of the EC co-operation in the transport field, examining its key objectives and their order of priority, and assessing (a) their relation to need; (b) their intended impacts; (c) their logic, context and overall coherence, including the assumptions, conditionality and risks attached to each. The evaluation team should also consider constraints, hypotheses/assumptions and external influences as they appear from documentation and interviews, and furthermore the external coherence of the programmes (in relation to other EU policies, Country needs and policies, other donors, other geopolitical factors).

For each **evaluation question**, the consultant will:

- identify an appropriate **judgement criterion** (or criteria); and select relevant quantitative and qualitative **indicators** for each Judgement Criterion identified (this in turn will determine the scope and methods of data collection).

On the basis of the Evaluation Questions and their corresponding Judgement Criteria and associated Indicators, the team will then identify and set out proposals for the following:

- i. Suitable methods of **data and information collection** both in Brussels and during the field phase - literature, interviews both structured and unstructured, questionnaires, seminars or workshops, case studies, etc. - indicating any limitations and describing how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis. If necessary, a *pilot field visit* may be proposed to verify the field phase methodology before the end of the preparatory element. The consultants will also propose a list of activities/projects/programmes that could be retained for in depth analysis during the completion phase. Choice of countries for field visits should be on the basis of clear and objective criteria justifying the approach to case studies which is being taken.

- ii. Appropriate *methods of analysis* of the information and data collected, again indicating any limitations; *and*
- iii. The basis to be used for making the *judgements*, which should be directly related to the Judgement Criteria set up during the first phase but adaptable should the field findings so dictate.

Following comments on the draft final report from members of the Steering Group and from the Evaluation Unit, the evaluators will present the final Report on the Preparatory Phase<sup>3</sup> setting out their results and detailing their proposed approach and methodology for the Completion Phase of the evaluation (eg. analytical grid for case studies, model of interview, example of questionnaires, etc.). The full Completion Phase will not start before the proposed approach and methodology have been approved by the Evaluation Unit, and a **final report on the preparatory phase** has been accepted. .

The consultants will propose the approach and methodology for the field visits as well as the structure of the final evaluation report, and a proposal for the allocation of financial and human resources to the Completion Phase of the evaluation.

The overall cost of the preparatory phase is expected to be (to be completed, including reimbursable etc)

#### 4.1.2. *The Completion Phase*

An updated Terms of Reference, purely related to the Preparatory Phase, will be prepared by the Evaluation Unit. This will specify the human resource and costs allocation agreed on the basis of the previous phase. As in the Preparatory Phase, the evaluation team will begin its work in the Completion Phase by delivering to the Evaluation Unit an **inception note** reiterating the *proposed approach* to the remaining steps of the evaluation, together with a statement of the proposed allocation of human and financial resources. After the Evaluation Unit's formal agreement to this proposal is secured, work will begin.

Following satisfactory completion of the inception report, the evaluation team will proceed to undertake the field missions. The fieldwork, the duration of which shall be discussed with the Steering Group, shall be undertaken on the basis set out in the Final Report of the Preparatory Phase, and agreed by the Steering Group. If during the course of the fieldwork any significant deviations from the agreed methodology or schedule are perceived as being necessary, these should be explained to the Steering Group through the Evaluation Unit. The Evaluation Unit may request to accompany the evaluators on field visits, though strictly in an observing capacity. The evaluation teams should be prepared to provide a full debriefing in the Commission delegations located in countries which are visited.

At the conclusion of the field study the team will proceed to prepare the **field mission report** for delivery by e-mail to the Steering Group through the Evaluation Unit no later than ten working days after returning from the field. The team will also give an **end-of-visit de-briefing** to the Steering Group in Brussels.

## 4.2. **Final evaluation report**

The evaluators will proceed with drafting the Final Evaluation Report. This draft will be structured as set out in Annex 3 and should take due account as appropriate of comments received during previous steering group meetings. It should be noted that after having answered the evaluative

---

<sup>3</sup> It should be drafted following the structure set out in Annex 2.

questions – and on the basis of these answers – the consultants shall provide an overall assessment of the EC strategy in the transport sector (see below Annex 3; § 4.2).

This *Draft Final Report* will be delivered to the steering group through the Evaluation Unit. Then, three working weeks will be allocated to the steering group in order to consider this draft. On the basis of comments received, the team of evaluators shall bring the appropriate final amendments before submitting their *Final Report* to the Evaluation Unit. The evaluators may either accept or reject the comments made by the Steering Group, but, in case of rejection, they shall motivate (in writing) their refusal.

Finally, the evaluation team (or part of it) will, at the conclusion of the study, take part in a seminar in Brussels to discuss the evaluation findings with the steering group and other relevant stakeholders.

The reports shall be drafted in French or English, with the main text of the final evaluation report in both languages. Field phase reports (which will appear in annex to the final report) should be written in the predominant working language of the delegation in the country concerned.

The written quality in the reports must be outstanding. The *findings, analysis, conclusions* and *recommendations* should be thorough. They should reflect a methodical and thoughtful approach to the evaluative questions, and finally the link or sequence between them should be clear.

## **5. STEERING GROUP**

The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by a Commission Steering Group consisting of members of the RELEX family services as well as other relevant Directorates General under the chairmanship of the Evaluation Unit.

This Steering Group will act as an interface between the evaluation team and Commission services. The members of the Steering Group will provide information and documentation on activities undertaken in the field of transport, and they will advise on the quality of work done by the consultants. Finally, the Steering Group will assist in feedback of the findings and recommendations from the evaluation into future programme design and delivery.

*Proposed Steering Group meetings are indicated with a \*\*\* in paragraph 7.1 below.*

## **6. EVALUATION TEAM**

This evaluation is to be carried out by a multi-disciplinary team with experience in at least the following fields: transport economics, civil engineering (transport infrastructure and services), environmental assessment, country strategy analysis, macroeconomics, private sector development, social development. Consultants should also possess an appropriate training and documented experience in the management of evaluations, as well as evaluation methods in field situations. The team should comprise consultants familiar with the main regions to be covered, but especially ACP, the TACIS countries and the Mediterranean.

The Evaluation Unit recommends strongly that consultants from beneficiary countries be employed (particularly, but not only, during the Field Phase).

## **7. TIMING AND BUDGET**

### **7.1. Calendar**

The evaluation will start in June 2002 with completion of the final report on the main study scheduled for July 2003.

The following is the indicative schedule:

– Inception Note for the Preparatory Phase	(working document for the launch meeting)
– *** Launch Meeting (Steering Group + consultants)	Mid-June 2002
– Preparatory Phase final report (first draft)	September 2002
– *** Steering Group Meeting	Three weeks after delivery of the Preparatory period final report (first draft)
– Preparatory Phase Final Report	mid-October
– Completion Phase Inception Report	1 November
– *** Steering Group Meeting (to prepare field visits)	mid-November
– Field Phase	Late-November
– Draft Report field phase	30 March 2003
– *** Steering Group meeting field phase and preparing final report phase	Three weeks after delivery of the draft field phase report
– Final Field Phase Report	Early May 2003
– Draft final report	May 2003
– *** SG meeting draft final report (*** possibly followed by a second SG meeting as required)	Three weeks after delivery of the draft final report
– Final report	c.15 July 2003
– (***) Seminar in Brussels	July 2003

### **7.2. Cost of the Evaluation**

The Preparatory Phase is expected to be undertaken within a limit of € 90.000 (excluding reimbursables).

In the inception report for the Preparatory Phase, the consultant will set out in detail the proposed allocation of human and financial resources for this phase as agreed by the Evaluation Unit.

At the end of the Preparatory Phase, the consultant will make a proposal for the cost of work and allocation of resources to be in the Completion Phase. The cost of the Completion Phase, including the field visits, will be determined on the basis of the Preparatory Phase final report, and particularly on the basis of discussion with the steering group regarding which countries should be visited and why. The agreed amount, and detailed proposal for resource allocation, will be reflected in the inception report for the Completion Phase.

Payment will take place on the following basis:

**Preparatory Phase**

Tranche 1 of payment of lump sum costs (30%), on acceptance of Inception report.

Tranche 2 of payment of lump sum costs (50%) on acceptance of Draft Final Report.

Tranche 3 of payment of lump sum costs (20%) on acceptance of Final Report.

**Completion Phase**

Tranche 1 of payment of lump sum costs (30%), on acceptance of Inception report.

Tranche 2 of payment of lump sum costs (50%) on acceptance of Draft Final Report.

Tranche 3 of payment of lump sum costs (20%) on acceptance of Final Report.

## **Annex 1: Key official documentation for the evaluation**

- COM (2000) 422 Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: *Promoting Sustainable transport in Development Co-operation*
- COM (2001) 126 Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: *Enhancing Euro-Mediterranean Co-operation on Transport and Energy*
- COM (2000) 212 Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - The European Community's Development Policy
- *Towards Sustainable Transport Infrastructure – A Sectoral Approach in Practice: Transport Sector Guidelines*, DG Development, 1996
- Regional Funding Conference for SE Europe – “Quick Start Package”
- Ten Pan-European Transport Corridors and Pan-European Transport Areas (MoUs etc)
- Previous Transport Sector Evaluation: TECNECON/ DG Development, 1995, and Synthesis Note (March 1994)
- PHARE Transport Evaluation, TRADEMCO etc, 1999
- National and Regional Monitoring Reports (to be specified)
- Partnership and Co-operation Agreements, Asia and LA Strategy Documents, Barcelona process documents
- ALA, TACIS and CARDS Regulations
- Country Strategy and Regional Strategy Papers
- World Bank Documentation “ Transport Economics and Sector Policy” (internet) <http://www.worldbank.org/transport/>
- Documentation of the EU-Russia Sub-Committee on Transport, Telecommunications and Space
- Northern Dimension Action Plan
- DG DEV Draft Guidelines for the Development of Indicators in Country Strategy Papers
- Programming Guidelines for the Transport Sector (DG Development, 2001)
- White Paper COM (2001) 370 European Transport Policy for 2010 – Time to Decide
- Liberalization of Shipping in West and Central Africa and the Role of Development Policy
- OECD DAC and World Bank databases – previous evaluation reports in the sector and new programming guidelines
- EIB Lists of past projects, reports and evaluations (to be specified)
- “Lomé IV – Programming of the Second Financial Protocol: Compilation of Sectoral Notes”, DG VIII, 1995
- Commission Manuals (DG VIII, AIDCO) on Project Cycle Management and Economic and Financial Analysis.

## **Annex 2: Outline Structure for the Reports**

### **Outline Structure of the Preparatory Phase Final Report**

Part 1: Reconstruction of the hierarchy, logic, related assumptions and intended impacts of the *objectives of the EC's interventions* in the field of transport.

Part 2: Presentation of the *key evaluation questions, judgement criteria* and associated *indicators*.

Part 3: *Analysis of the information and data* available at the end of the first phase and indications of any missing data, so as to inform the work plan for the field phase.

Part 4: Proposed *field phase methodology* (methods of enquiry, data collection and sampling, &c vis-à-vis the information sought).

Part 5: Proposed *analysis methodology* based on sound and recognised methods used for evaluation.

## ANNEX 3

### Outline Structure of the Final Evaluation Report

*Length:* The overall length of the final evaluation report should not be greater than *50 pages* (including the executive summary). Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes (which however should be restricted to the important information).

#### 1. Executive Summary

*Length: 5 pages maximum*

This executive summary must produce the following information:

- 1.1 – Purpose of the evaluation;
- 1.2 – Background to the evaluation;
- 1.3 – Methodology;
- 1.4 – Analysis and main findings for each Evaluative Question; short overall assessment;
- 1.5 – Main conclusions;\*
- 1.6 – Main recommendations.\*

*\* Conclusions and recommendations must be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance to the evaluation and their importance, and they should also be cross-referenced back to the key findings. Length-wise, the parts dedicated to the conclusions and recommendations should represent about 40 % of the executive summary*

#### 2. Introduction

*Length: 5 pages*

- 2.1. Synthesis of the Commission's Strategy and Programmes: their objectives, how they are prioritised and ordered, their logic both *internally* (ie. the existence – or not – of a logical link between the EC policies and instruments and expected impacts) and *externally* (ie. Within the context of the needs of the country, government policies, and the programmes of other donors); the implicit assumptions and risk factors; the intended impacts of the Commission's interventions.\*
- 2.2. Context: brief analysis of the political, economic, social and cultural dimensions, as well as the needs, potential for and main constraints.\*
- 2.3. Purpose of the Evaluation: presentation of the evaluative questions

*\* Only the main points of these sections should be developed within the report. More detailed treatment should be confined to annexes*

#### 3. Methodology

*Length: 10 pages*

In order to answer the evaluative questions a number of methodological instruments must be presented by the consultants:

- 3.1. Judgement Criteria: which should have been selected (for each Evaluation Question) and agreed upon by the steering group;
- 3.2. Indicators: attached to each judgement criterion. This in turn will determine the scope and methods of data collection;
- 3.3. Data and Information Collection: can consist of literature review, interviews, questionnaires, case studies, etc. The consultants will indicate any limitations and will describe how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis.
- 3.4. Methods of Analysis: of the data and information obtained for each Evaluation Question (again indicating any eventual limitations);
- 3.5. Methods of Judgement

#### **4. Main Findings and Analysis**

*Length: 20 to 30 pages*

- 4.1. Answers to each Evaluative Question, indicating findings and conclusions for each;
- 4.2. Overall assessment of the EC Strategy. This assessment should cover:
  - Relevance to needs and overall context, including development priorities and co-ordination with other donors;
  - Actual Impacts: established, compared to intended impacts, as well as unforeseen impacts or deadweight/substitution effects;
  - Effectiveness in terms of how far the intended results were achieved;
  - Efficiency: in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed or hindered the achievement of results;
  - Sustainability: whether the results can be maintained over time.

#### **5. A Full Set of Conclusions and Recommendations**

*Length: 10 pages*

A Full set of Conclusions\* and Recommendations\* (i) for each evaluation question; (ii) as an overall judgement. (As an introduction to this chapter a short mention of the main objectives of the country programmes and whether they have been achieved )

*\*All conclusions should be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate findings. Recommendations must be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance and importance to the purpose of the evaluation (also they shall be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate conclusions).*