



**EN**

**THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**ANNEX 2**

of the Commission Implementing Decision on the financing of the annual action plan in favour of the NDICI Neighbourhood East Region for 2022

**Action Document for**

**Improving Road Safety in the Eastern Partnership Region**

**ANNUAL ACTION PLAN**

This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation, and action plan/measure in the sense of Article 23(2) of NDICI-Global Europe Regulation.

**1. SYNOPSIS**

**1.1. Action Summary Table**

<b>1. Title OPSYS Basic Act</b>	Improving Road Safety in the Eastern Partnership Region Annual action plan CRIS number/OSPYS business reference: CRIS: NDICI-GEO-NEAR/2022/44021 OPSYS: ACT-60973 – JAD.996560 Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI-Global Europe).
<b>2. Team Europe Initiative</b>	No
<b>3. Zone benefiting from the action</b>	The action shall be carried out in the Eastern Neighbourhood Region.
<b>4. Programming document</b>	Multiannual Indicative Programme for the Neighbourhood East Region for the period 2021-2027 <sup>1</sup>
<b>5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives/expected results</b>	Specific Objective 2: Support <b>transport and connectivity</b> ( <i>including for the Black Sea</i> )
<b>PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION</b>	
<b>6. Priority Area(s), sectors</b>	Priority area 1: Resilient, sustainable and integrated economies

<sup>1</sup> C(2021)9370 adopted on 15/12/2021

<b>7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</b>	<b>Main SDG:</b> SDG 3 Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages. <b>Other significant SDGs:</b> SDG 11 Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.			
<b>8 a) DAC code(s)</b>	21010 - Transport policy and administrative management 100 %			
<b>8 b) Main Delivery Channel</b>	20000 Non-governmental organisations and civil society 51000 University, college or other teaching institution, research institute or think-tank			
<b>9. Targets</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input type="checkbox"/> Climate <input type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance			
<b>10. Markers (from DAC form)</b>	<b>General policy objective</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with Disabilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>RIO Convention markers</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Biological diversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>11. Internal markers and Tags</b>	<b>Policy objectives</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>
Digitalisation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tags digital connectivity		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	/

	digital governance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	/
	digital entrepreneurship	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	digital skills/literacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	digital services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Connectivity</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Tags			/
	digital connectivity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	energy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	education and research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Migration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reduction of Inequalities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	COVID-19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### BUDGET INFORMATION

<b>12. Amounts concerned</b>	Budget line(s) (article, item): Budget line: BGUE-B2022-14.020111-C1-NEAR Total estimated cost: EUR 3 000 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 3 000 000
------------------------------	--

### MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

<b>13. Implementation modalities (type of financing and management mode)</b>	Project Modality <b>Direct management</b> through: - Grants - Procurement
--	--

## 1.2. Summary of the Action

The action's overall objective is to support the Eastern Partnership countries in improving land transport safety by providing the required support to promptly and efficiently advance towards the reduction of road traffic fatal and non-fatal injuries. For this purpose, the action will develop a solid body of evidence-based approaches in the area of road safety in the Eastern Partnership (EaP) region.

The action will support the set-up and operation of a regional Eastern Partnership Road Safety Observatory (EaP RSO) in line with the 2018 Eastern Partnership Declaration on Road Safety<sup>2</sup> that sets the target of reducing the number of fatal and serious road traffic injuries by 50% in the period from 2020 to 2030. The EaP Road Safety Observatory aims to reinforce national road safety data collection, facilitate the creation of more robust national road safety systems and provide the necessary evidence for efficient policy making. The Observatory will also serve as a platform for sharing best practices and as a tool for benchmarking road safety performance. The action will also support the partner countries in developing, implementing and monitoring of national road safety strategies and action plans. As a result, the action will provide necessary assistance to improve the quality of road safety related data and knowledge on road safety performance, which is essential for the design of strategies and measures in order to achieve a reduction in road casualties.

<sup>2</sup> [https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2018-05/eap\\_declaration\\_finalversion2604.pdf](https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2018-05/eap_declaration_finalversion2604.pdf)

## 2. RATIONALE

### 2.1. Context

By endorsing the Valletta Declaration<sup>3</sup> on road safety of March 2017 through Council conclusions, EU transport ministers set a clear target for reducing serious injuries, namely to halve the number of serious injuries in the EU in the period from 2020 to 2030. In February 2020 the EU welcomed the Stockholm Declaration,<sup>4</sup> which reinforces the EU's own 'Vision Zero' aspirations. The EU Road Safety Policy Framework 2021-2030 aims at halving the number of fatalities and serious injuries on European roads by 2030, as a milestone on the way to zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2050. In the same manner, the Eastern Partnership Declaration on Road Safety, endorsed in April 2018 in Ljubljana, sets the target of reducing the number of fatal and serious road traffic injuries by 50% from 2020 to 2030. In order to reach these goals, the Eastern Partnership Transport Ministerial Meeting, on 6 June 2019 in Luxemburg, endorsed a joint declaration<sup>5</sup> announcing that the countries will work together towards the establishment of a Regional Eastern Partnership Road Safety Observatory (EaP RSO).

Since its establishment in 2009, the Eastern dimension of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) has aimed at deepening and strengthening relations between the EU and its Eastern neighbours by providing necessary support to political and socio-economic reforms in partner countries and enhance sectorial cooperation. As confirmed on numerous occasions and in different formats, transport connectivity is high on the agenda of the Eastern Partnership process, as it plays a key role in achieving the partnership's objectives and further integration.

The March 2020 Joint Communication on the Eastern Partnership (EaP) policy beyond 2020<sup>6</sup> outlined the following long-term policy objectives for future cooperation: *(1) deliver economies that work for all; (2) strengthen the fundamentals, such as accountable institutions and rule of law; (3) boost our green transformation; (4) support the digital transformation and (5) build fair and inclusive societies*. Increasing resilience was defined as the central goal for the new Eastern Partnership agenda. In this context, the Joint Communication sets out a clear vision for the EaP region for the future and committed to increase the use of EU and international transport standards, including in the area of road safety. The Russian invasion of Ukraine will certainly have a considerable impact on the Eastern Partnership agenda. It will be adapted in such a way as for the EU to be able to respond rapidly and effectively to the needs of Ukraine in particular and the Eastern partner countries as a whole.

The Joint Staff Working Document "*Recovery, resilience and reform: post 2020 Eastern Partnership priorities*"<sup>7</sup> published in July 2021 outlines the EaP priorities and targets for the post-2020 agenda in the context of recovery, resilience and reform, aims at enhanced cooperation in the area of road safety including launching the Eastern Partnership Regional Road Safety Observatory in line with the 2018 Eastern Partnership Declaration on Road Safety.

In this context, the EU has been supporting the process of setting up a regional EaP RSO. The Eastern Partner Countries have already agreed to work jointly within the framework of the RSO, including as part of the existing Road Safety Working and National Data Coordinators (NDCs) Groups. The countries also agreed to

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://eumos.eu/valletta-declaration-improving-road-safety/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.roadsafetysweden.com/contentassets/b37f0951c837443eb9661668d5be439e/stockholm-declaration-english.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/39655/eastern-partnership-joint-declaration.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> JOIN(2020) 7

<sup>7</sup>SWD(2021)

share road safety-related data (CADaS - standardised protocol of crash-related variables and MiniCADaS - simplified version of CADaS) on an annual basis within the EaP RSO.

The EU launched a Call for Expression of Interest to select the hosting country of the EaP RSO in 2021. As a result of the selection process, Georgia was formally announced as the hosting country of the EaP RSO in July 2021.

Furthermore, the EU is currently facilitating the process of signature of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the EaP Partner Countries to formally establish the Observatory. Through an administrative agreement with the World Bank, the EU put at countries' disposal the technical expertise and knowledge required by the relevant road safety authorities in the EaP countries to develop the draft MoU. The signature of the MoU will formally establish the Observatory's governing structure: the Steering Committee and the Observatory's Technical Secretariat. The Technical Secretariat will be hosted in Georgia in line with the results of the Call for Expression of Interest.

## 2.2. Problem Analysis

### Short problem analysis

The overwhelming majority of road traffic deaths and serious injuries are preventable. Despite some improvements in the EaP region, they remain a major public health and development problem that has broad social and economic consequences. Apart from the human suffering caused, studies suggest that the combined costs of road fatalities and injuries of up to 5.7 % of their gross domestic product a year in EaP countries makes reducing road traffic deaths and injuries both an economic and a social priority.<sup>8</sup>

The average road crash fatality rate in the EaP Region is 8.28 fatalities per 100,000 inhabitants. The EaP fatality rate is 49.3% higher than that of the EU-27. Belarus has the lowest fatality rate (6.11 fatalities/100,000 inhabitants), while Georgia has the highest fatality rate (12.11 fatalities/100,000 inhabitants). Other countries' fatality rates range between 6.91-11.74 fatalities/100,000 inhabitants. The actual fatality rate for the region may be higher, given that the fatality rates for the individual countries have not been corrected for under-reporting.<sup>9</sup>

Improvement in the national road safety policies, strategies and annual action plans is key to reduce fatal and non-fatal traffic injuries. One of the main issues to develop road safety policy strategies in the EaP partner countries to reduce the number of injuries relate to the lack of quality in collected, processed and reported road safety data. In particular, it has been established that data discrepancy in the EaP region reported at the national level and corrected by WHO (for each country) has been estimated at between 14 to 22% in 2009-2019. This shows a high level of underreporting in the region, presumably due to a lack of a robust data collection systems that are interlinked with hospitals, police and other actors within the countries. Armenia has the highest level of under-reporting, 42%, while Azerbaijan and Moldova have the lowest levels of under-reporting, 3% and 6% respectively. Belarus, Georgia and Ukraine have average levels of under-reporting, between 21-30%. The decision making in road safety management is highly dependent upon road safety data. Consequently, based on the conducted studies, all EaP states "need to adapt their crash-related data collection to international standards and expand data collection to other road safety aspects, thus creating more robust regional and national road safety systems."<sup>10</sup>

To address these issues and to improve the quality of the reported data as well as evidence-based approach to relevant policy-making, the EaP Partners have expressed their commitment to work towards the establishment

---

<sup>8</sup><https://www.roadsafetyfacility.org/publications/guide-road-safety-opportunities-and-challenges-low-and-middle-income-country-profiles>

<sup>9</sup> World Bank. *EASTERN PARTNERSHIP (EaP) ROAD SAFETY REGIONAL PROFILE*, 2021

<sup>10</sup> World Bank, *Improving Road Safety Data: Towards developing a regional Eastern Partnership Road Safety Observatory*, 2021.

of a Regional Eastern Partnership Road Safety Observatory. The EaP RSO should provide analytical support for adjusting national road safety policies, strategies and annual action plans by improving data collection and analysis practices and remedying the underreporting of this data. In this respect, it is necessary to support the setting up and the operation of the EaP RSO, to establish a more efficient road safety data system, to assist the beneficiary countries to adapt their crash-related data collection to international standards (targeting CADaS and MiniCADaS) and to expand data collection to other road safety aspects. This will create more robust regional and national road safety systems.

### *Main stakeholders*

The new Global Plan for the UN Decade of Action on Road Safety 2021-2030 calls on governments to implement an integrated Safe System Approach to road safety. This recognises the fundamental importance of partnerships involving various government departments, public and private sector entities, non-governmental organisations and community stakeholder groups to achieve reductions in road casualties. These stakeholders include:

- Heads of Road Safety Departments in each country and Steering Committee members of this action
- Government Ministries – Economy, Internal Affairs, Transport, Health and others
- Within these ministries, operational agencies including Road Police, Health Authorities, State Road administrations, Emergency Services and others
- Local authorities in country regions, and municipalities
- Private sector entities including insurance companies, logistics companies, transport providers
- Local road safety non-governmental organisations
- Car clubs
- Regional organisations dealing with road safety

Each of these categories of stakeholders collect and retain data of importance to road safety employing different methodologies, often giving different results. They will need to be consulted and their cooperation should be secured as far as practical.

Other important stakeholders include organisations representing vulnerable road users – for example, people with disabilities, parents, women, elderly people, cyclists and farmers. They will also have a direct interest in the communications of the EaP RSO and the policy interventions that result from the data analysis. It will be important to work with non-state partners to ensure good communication and involvement.

### **2.3. Lessons Learned**

Although the current action does not have a direct predecessor, experience can be drawn from the previous stages of the process of setting up the EaP RSO. In some cases, the process was delayed by the situation in the beneficiary countries due to various reasons, such as political instability, lack of dedicated human resources and management fluctuation. A key lesson learned is therefore the importance of maintaining active communication with local partners in each country to ensure the success of EaP RSO initiatives.

In addition, the EU-funded regional transport project “TRACECA-Road safety II” implemented from 2014 to 2016 which had the objective to assist ten beneficiary countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) in implementing the TRACECA Regional Road Safety Action Plan can provide some lessons learned. The project provided assistance to the beneficiary countries to strengthen their institutional capacity and to develop and implement country specific road safety action plans. The action will build on the experience from this past action, particularly in terms of management of road crash data.

Furthermore, throughout the years there have been initiatives worldwide, which can be considered “road safety observatories” and from which experience can be drawn in establishing the EaP RSO. These include the following:

- International Road Traffic Safety Data and Analysis Group (IRTAD): A working group within the International Transportation Forum at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD);
- Initiatives within the framework of the WHO: WHO is the United Nations (UN) agency responsible for measuring the progress of the Decade for Action on Road Safety and SDG 3.6;
- European Road Safety Observatory<sup>11</sup> which draws largely on the Community Database on Road Accidents (CARE) to which all EU and EFTA countries provide annual data;
- Iberoamerican Observatory of Road Safety (OISEVI): OISEVI was set up as a collaboration between governments with a technical secretariat operated by one of the member countries;
- Western Balkans Road Safety Observatory<sup>12</sup>;
- African Road Safety Observatory;
- Asian Pacific Road Safety Observatory.<sup>13</sup>

Some of these initiatives and the long-standing observatories have evolved over the years to broaden both the type of data they collect (beyond crash data into performance indicators and exposure measures) and the activities they undertake, most notably setting up forums for policy debate. Their work has been based on existing road safe data which has provided a solid basis for policy-making. Therefore, as a first step the EaP RSO will focus on establishing a solid body of evidence-based approaches to ensure availability of policy-relevant road safety data for decision-making purposes. Going forward the EaP RSO should extend the range of activities and, when appropriate, add other indicators and performance indicators as derived from international experience to date. As its strategic orientation, the action will encourage the EaP RSO to use the experience from CARE as a basis, with the understanding that it focuses more on joint data analysis and analytical capacity building at the country level.

Finally, the COVID-19 world pandemic, as well as conflicts in some countries, had a profound impact on the area of road safety, not only globally, but also in the partner countries. The pandemic has not only decreased road traffic and therefore financial resources of the partner states as the focus shifted to other priorities and tasks. Maintaining the active engagement from the partner countries throughout the implementation of the action is therefore key to achieving the objectives.

### **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION**

#### **3.1. Objectives and Expected Outputs**

The Overall Objective (Impact) of this action is to promptly advance towards the reduction of road traffic fatal and non-fatal injuries in the EaP Region.

The Specific Objective (Outcome) of this action is to create a solid body of evidence-based approaches to ensure availability of policy-relevant road safety data for decision-making purposes.

The Outputs to be delivered by this action contributing to the corresponding Specific Objective (Outcomes) 1 are:

---

<sup>11</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/transport/road\\_safety/statistics-and-analysis/data-and-analysis\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/statistics-and-analysis/data-and-analysis_en)

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.transport-community.org/wbrso/>

<sup>13</sup> Improving Road Safety Data in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine: Towards Developing a Regional Eastern Partnership Road Safety Observatory, the WBD, p. 4

- 1.1 Beneficiary countries' capacities in developing and implementation of the national road safety strategies and/or actions plans, where requested, as well as in collecting, managing and using data as well as in data analysis to support road safety policies and actions improved.
- 1.2 Data collection across the region to allow better comparison as well as underpin regional initiatives, based upon MiniCADaS and CADaS crash reporting simplified and streamlined.
- 1.3 Technologies for data collection to improve timeliness, accuracy, completeness, and relevance to policy formulation simplified and unified.
- 1.4 Local capacity within the host country/institution on crash data management/analysis strengthened and smooth operation of road safety observatory developed.
- 1.5 Road safety data and practices regularly communicated to a wider audience to encourage a safe system approach.

### **3.2. Indicative Activities**

Activities related to *Output 1.1 Beneficiary countries' capacities in developing and implementation of the national road safety strategies and/or actions plans, where requested, as well as in collecting, managing and using data as well as in data analysis to support road safety policies and actions improved:*

- Supporting national authorities, where relevant, in drafting their road safety national strategies for the new decade and/or shorter-term action plans that give countries greater flexibility to, for example, introduce new policies/measures or to adapt existing ones, in order to better meet the 2030 targets;
- Monitoring the implementation of existing national road safety strategies/action plans, where requested, for each country and subsequently drafting a biennial progress report with a country-by-country analysis and a comparative analysis based on a common methodology. This analysis could include the legislative and non-legislative measures taken and identify gaps in implementation in each country and how these are being addressed. Work should be done in close partnership with national authorities but it should also involve other stakeholders at national and local level, where appropriate;
- Supporting the work of the EaP RSO Steering Group;
- Identifying common areas of training needs and carrying out joint webinars/training seminars to address these needs, thus enhancing the awareness in the relevant national road safety institutions regarding the importance for good data collection and analysis;
- Identifying and exchanging examples of good road safety policy measures and methods to monitor their effectiveness covering various areas e.g. road safety audits and blackspots treatment, etc.;
- Promoting the inclusion of references to data, indicators, analysis, monitoring and target setting in the development of national strategies and action plans.

Activities related to *Output 1.2 Data collection across the region to allow better comparison as well as underpin regional initiatives, based upon MiniCADaS and CADaS crash reporting simplified and streamlined:*

- Carrying out detailed investigations into improvements required by beneficiary countries, specific stakeholders to address areas of particular need and developing targeted recommendations in this regard;
- Developing and sharing relevant documents on the EaP RSO website giving guidance and showing progress on implementing MiniCADaS and CADaS crash reporting, gathering Maximum Abbreviated Injury Scale - MAIS3+ data on serious injuries and collecting data for safety performance indicators and conducting specific training on these topics.

Activities related to *Output 1.3 Technologies for data collection to improve timeliness, accuracy, completeness, and relevance to policy formulation simplified and unified:*



- Conducting training and building capacity targeting the dedicated staff of the host institute for managing the central database of road safety related data;
- Conducting training and building capacity for National Data Coordinators regarding the specifics of operation of the central database of road safety related data;
- Raising awareness of the dedicate staff in the national road safety administrations and of National Data coordinators regarding the functioning of the World Bank’s DRIVER<sup>14</sup> platform and other data analysis tools, and carrying out targeted consultations with them to foster skills for use of available technologies;
- Carrying out specific studies to collect data in addition to MiniCADaS, including MAIS3+ and road safety performance indicators (SPIs), which are important for policy and practice. The indicative list of data to be collected is the set of 8 key performance indicators which are part of the EU Baseline project<sup>15</sup>.

Activities related to *Output 1.4 Local capacity within the host country/institution on crash data management/analysis strengthened and smooth operation of road safety observatory developed:*

- Establishing a monitoring framework to provide early indications of progress, or lack thereof, as regards the achievement of results in order to enable effective review of the operation of the Observatory and to improve its performance as well as possibly identify the way forward for the financial sustainability of the observatory;
- Conducting training needs assessment of the relevant personnel of the host country on crash data management/analysis and operation of the Road Safety Observatory;
- Conducting trainings for the relevant personnel of the host country on crash data management/analysis and operation of the Road Safety Observatory;
- Providing relevant equipment necessary for the operation and fulfilment of functions of the Road Safety Observatory and its technical secretariat.

Activities related to *Output 1.5 Road safety data and practices regularly communicated to a wider audience to encourage a safe system approach throughout the EaP region:*

- Developing the EaP RSO website, including identification of the main features in consultation with beneficiary countries;
- Establishing a working group and lines of communication with each national group for adding timely and compelling content to the website;
- Ensuring the data sharing, exchange of best practice and case studies; and sharing notices of significant national, regional and global events in the area of road safety;
- Developing an EaP RSO Communications Strategy to include the use of media, social media, and important stakeholder forums for targeting visibility initiatives, and promoting EaP RSO members, experts and key partners to ensure visibility at regional or global road safety events;
- Representing the EaP RSO in the Global Network of Road Safety Observatories and at other international fora;
- Working with Steering Group members, identifying areas of common interest for regional policy initiatives and thematic reports for publication and action by the EaP RSO, and promoting dissemination via the website and Communications Strategy;

Developing a concept and conducting a communication campaign to promote road safety and the work of regional and national road safety observatories.

<sup>14</sup> <https://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/383191522246101256/GRSF-Newsletter-Spring-032618-rev3.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> <https://baseline.vias.be/en/publications/methodological-guidelines-kpi/>

### 3.3. Mainstreaming

#### Environmental Protection, Climate Change and Biodiversity

**Outcomes of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening** (relevant for budget support and strategic-level interventions)

The SEA screening concluded that no further action was required.

The environmental protection, climate change and biodiversity impact have been assessed in the identification, formulation and quality support review phase.

**Outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening** (relevant for projects and/or specific interventions within a project).

The EIA screening classified the action as Category C (no need for further assessment).

**Outcome of the Climate Risk Assessment (CRA) screening** (relevant for projects and/or specific interventions within a project)

The CRA screening concluded that this action is no or low risk (no need for further assessment).

#### Gender equality and empowerment of women and girls

As per OECD Gender DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as G1 – gender as a significant objective. This implies that gender equality is an important and deliberate objective but not the principal reason of the action, thus, it will be mainstreamed in the activities.

Gender equality is a significant objective in this action due to the under-reporting of road deaths and injuries affecting women and girls, and the absence in many cases of a gender analysis in road data. There is an underlying assumption that motorised transport is gender neutral and available to all, however this is not the case. There is still a focus on enabling faster movements for vehicles by building bigger and wider roads rather than controlling speeds and encouraging active mobility. This attitude is evident, too, in some very short crossing times at traffic lights that make it more difficult for elderly people (predominantly women), people with small children and people with disabilities to cross safely. A systematic gender analysis of road data showing how women and girls interact with the road network, how they are impacted by road developments, and how they figure among road casualties is vital for public planning.

The action will be coherent with the EU Gender Equality Strategy<sup>16</sup> and the EU Gender Action Plan (GAP) III<sup>17</sup>. The evaluation and monitoring framework of the action will consider gender-disaggregated indicators.

#### Human Rights

This is also a significant objective (G1). The UN Sustainable Development Goals include in SDG 11.2 the goal to “*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*” by 2023. Without reliable data on different road user groups with sufficient detail to allow evaluation, it will be difficult to measure progress on this UN Goal. Access to affordable, accessible and safe mobility is an important right – enabling individuals

---

<sup>16</sup> COM(2020) 152 final

<sup>17</sup> JOIN (2020) 17 final.

to fully participate in the economic and social life of their countries. This action will improve the richness and usefulness of data for measuring progress towards SDG 11.2.

## Disability

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as D1.

As is the case for gender and human rights considerations, understanding the impact of the road network on people with disabilities will be an important concern for the EaP RSO in considering data improvement. Data is generally lacking on the representation of people with disabilities among different road user groups. However special studies have demonstrated that for all categories of disability, disabled people have far fewer mobility options and are also far more at risk when using the road network. For example, a study by the Automobile Club in Moldova, found that 40% of people with disabilities and their carers reported finding it very difficult to cross the road. These types of surveys are important for developing more inclusive transport systems and road infrastructure, and can be facilitated by the EaP RSO.

Another important task of the EaP RSO will be to better align data between the road police and health authorities to allow for a crosscheck on the fate of road crash victims. This will enable better documentation not only in terms of the accuracy of road fatality data, but also better estimations of the long-term impact of road crashes and better documentation of long-lasting disabilities as a result of road injury. This information is vital for making policy decisions which address the needs of people with disabilities and their families, as well as giving people with disabilities a greater voice in promoting those improvements via access to better impact data.

## Democracy

The development of the EaP RSO website will include a greater sharing of data across the region as well as nationally. It is hoped that this will include more transparency in road data to allow more public advocacy on issues of road safety.

## Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience

Not addressed by the action.

## Disaster Risk Reduction

Not addressed by the action.

### 3.4. Risks and Assumptions

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/ Medium/ Low)	Impact (High/ Medium/ Low)	Mitigating measures
1 - External Environment	Risk 1 Ongoing Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine and its consequences for project	High	High	Continuous monitoring and assessment of the situation, continuous dialogue with the beneficiary countries involved to ensure the sustainability of activities.

	implementation risks in the whole EaP region.			
1 - External Environment	Risk 2 lack of political commitment from the participating countries over the duration of the action.	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	<p>Continuous dialogue with national authorities on issues related to road safety.</p> <p>As part of its communication campaign, the action will have specific outreach activities with key civil society representatives and other relevant public and private stakeholders. Thus, the action will aim at sufficiently engaging relevant institutions through continuous communications and visibility activities and at supporting national bodies by disseminating information about the importance of road safety, the benefits and impact of the action.</p>
1 - External Environment	Risk 3 delays in the signature of the Memorandum of understanding by the countries.	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	<p>Constant communication with various stakeholders engaged in the process of signature of the MoU, including DG MOVE, EUDs in the EaP countries, the World Bank.</p>
1 - External Environment	Risk 4 – COVID-19 pandemic affects possibility of arranging Steering Group meetings or conducting activities in countries.	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>	<p>Most meetings will be conducted virtually. Training can be conducted via online platforms. The communication with all Beneficiary countries’ representatives will thus be actively maintained.</p> <p>In-country activities which absolutely require face-to-face meetings (e.g. carrying out surveys) will be carried out by local experts with online support from international experts. Other activities can be timetabled for when restrictions are limited.</p> <p>A COVID-safe Policy will be implemented by all participants and experts involved in the operation of the Observatory.</p>
2 - Risk to planning, processes and systems	Risk 5 – National events in partner countries (e.g. elections) may	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>	<p>The action will ensure that an active dialogue is maintained in beneficiary countries and with this events and processes can be timetabled with flexibility to fit national partner needs.</p>

	affect planning and processes.			
3 – Risk to people and the organisation	Risk 6 – National Data Coordinators may change, affecting continuity.	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>	The development and signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between beneficiary countries is designed to ensure continuity, with active involvement by key national authorities
4 – Risk to legality and regularity aspects	Risk 7 – With data collection, risk of misuse of personal data.	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	Most road incident data shared by police authorities is cleaned of personal details.  A policy will be strictly enforced requiring all data to be cleaned of personal details at the source.  Training will be conducted to support this.
4 – Risk to legality and regularity aspects	Risk 8 – With communications, risk of misuse of contact data.	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	GDPR regulations will be strictly enforced.  No personal data will be shared on the public face of the website. Within the countries, contact details will be shared only with permission.
5 – Risk to communication and information	Risk 9 – Website may be hacked.	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>	Preventive measures will be strictly employed including: keeping all software up-to-date, being vigilant for Structured Query Language (SQL) injection or cross-site scripting, requiring validation on both the browser and server sides, checking passwords, allowing file uploads only via the Secretariat, using HTTPS, etc.
5 – Risk to communication and information	Risk 10 – Mis-communication in social media posts.	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	A Communications Strategy will be developed by the Secretariat and adopted involving a team, so that communications will be checked before going live. All the activities will be supported by dedicated staff.

### External Assumptions

- Factors outside the project’s control that may affect the outcome-impact linkage, such as continued political, social and economic stability in the region, are favourable for implementation;

- The hostilities cease and the security situation in Ukraine is stable enough to allow for implementation;
- Signature of the Memorandum of Understanding formally establishing the EaP RSO is progressing.
- Beneficiary countries are fully collaborating;
- Beneficiary countries have the technical equipment necessary for collection of all variables;
- Capacity to carry out necessary training is not affected by pandemic (training conducted virtually)
- Timely agreement on joint communications.

### **3.5. Intervention Logic**

The underlying intervention logic for this action is that the lack of reliable road safety and traffic data leads to a high number of road traffic deaths and injuries, thus posing a considerable social and economic cost to countries. These data are essential to assess the full nature of deficiencies in the area of road safety, to ensure safe access to mobility and to develop effective policy measures to reduce road death and injury, particularly for vulnerable road users.

The action will therefore support data collection and the establishment of management methods that converge to meet standard international criteria and provide a stable basis for analysis between countries. Therefore a regional approach to improving data collection and management is an efficient and cost-effective way to work across borders with countries which share similar challenges to raise data collection and management standards via training, sharing best practice and through the adoption of regional road safety goals founded on evidence-based strategies.

The outputs will contribute to these objectives by increasing the understanding of the beneficiary countries as regards the importance and utility of reliable data, enabling swifter progress towards standard international practice in data collection and management and promoting standardisation of data at regional level. Where national data is lacking, conducting targeted studies and surveys will develop this further and allow for further international comparisons as well as development of local evidence-based policy responses. A dedicated EaP RSO website will facilitate communication between beneficiary countries (via a member portal), and will enable the sharing of data, thematic reports and events with the general public and civil society. Participation by beneficiary countries and dedicated staff tasked with the operation of the EaP RSO in global road safety events will give recognition to those members for their progress and help to advertise the work of the EaP RSO, enabling more widespread sharing and dialogue across borders. Furthermore, to assist the countries in the process of introducing new road safety policies and measures, the action will provide support to the national authorities, where required, in developing, implementation and monitoring of their national road safety strategies and action plans.

### 3.6. Indicative Logical Framework Matrix

Results	Results chain: Main expected results	Indicators	Baselines (values and years) <sup>18</sup>	Targets (values and years) <sup>19</sup>	Sources of data	Assumptions
<b>Impact</b>	To promptly and efficiently advance towards the reduction of road traffic fatal and non-fatal injuries in the EaP region	<p>1. use of data to develop evidence-based approaches to road safety management</p> <p>2. annual road fatalities across the Eastern Partnership region in line with the 2030 reduction target</p>	<p>1. 2021: no evidence-based approaches in EaP Partner countries available</p> <p>2. 2021: current rate of road fatalities in line with the 50% target by 2030 not available</p>	<p>1. 2027: One evidence-based approach developed across all EaP RSO countries within the project lifetime</p> <p>2. Reduction of road fatalities in line with the 50% target by 2030</p>	<p>1 EaP RSO beneficiary countries</p> <p>2 WHO data</p>	<i>Not applicable</i>

<sup>18</sup> Baseline values will be inserted at a later stage in the description of the action

<sup>19</sup> Idem

<p><b>Outcome 1</b></p>	<p>1 A solid body of evidence-based approaches to ensure availability of policy-relevant road safety data for decision-making purposes created</p>	<p>1.1 Creation of a unified road injury database with inputs from all beneficiary countries</p> <p>1.2 Additional data available in this database for all countries on key road risks</p>	<p>1.1 2021: No current unified road injury database</p> <p>1.2 2021: No current sharing of key risk data</p>	<p>1.1 2023: A unified road injury database housed in host institution</p> <p>1.2 2027: Increased sharing of data to this database</p>	<p>1.1 Project progress reports</p> <p>1.2 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat</p>	<p>Factors outside the project's control that may affect the outcome-impact linkage, such as continued political, social and economic stability in the region, are favourable for implementation</p> <p>The hostilities cease and the security situation in Ukraine is stable enough to allow for implementation</p> <p>Signature of the Memorandum of Understanding formally establishing the EaP RSO</p>
-------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--



<p><b>Output 1 related to Outcome 1</b></p>	<p>1.1 Beneficiary countries' capacities in developing and implementation of the national road safety strategies and/or actions plans, where requested, as well as in collecting, managing and using data as well as in data analysis to support road safety policies and actions improved</p>	<p>1.1.1 Post-training evaluation carried out showing improved knowledge</p> <p>1.1.2 Implemented capacity-building programme on road safety data collection and analysis carried out</p> <p>1.1.3 Beneficiary countries supported in development, implementation and monitoring of the national road safety strategies, actions plans within the wider framework of EaP RSO operations.</p>	<p>1.1.1 2021: No evaluation of training impact</p> <p>1.1.2 2021: 0%</p> <p>1.1.3 2021: No beneficiary countries supported in development, implementation and monitoring of the national road safety strategies, actions plans within the wider framework of EaP RSO</p>	<p>1.1.1 2027: Evaluation of training workshop via surveys and questionnaires</p> <p>1.1.2 2027: Implementation rate 100%</p> <p>1.1.3 2027: At least 2 beneficiary countries supported in development, implementation and monitoring of the national road safety strategies, actions plans within the wider framework of EaP RSO</p>	<p>1.1.1 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO training and evaluation experts</p> <p>1.1.2 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO training and evaluation experts</p> <p>1.1.3 EaP RSO activity and progress reports.</p>	<p>Beneficiary countries are fully collaborating.</p> <p>Beneficiary countries have the technical equipment necessary for collection of all variables</p>
---	--	--	---	---	---	---

<p><b>Output related Outcome 1</b></p> <p><b>2 to</b></p>	<p>1.2 Data collection across the region to allow better comparison as well as underpin regional initiatives, based upon MiniCADaS and CADaS crash reporting simplified and streamlined</p>	<p>1.2.1 Beneficiary countries show improvements in data collection based upon MiniCADaS</p> <p>1.2.2 Beneficiary countries show improvements in data collection based upon CADaS</p>	<p>1.2.1 2021: No beneficiary country currently fully aligned with MiniCADaS</p> <p>1.2.2 2021: No Beneficiary country currently aligned with CADaS</p>	<p>1.2.1 2027: All beneficiary countries show improvements approaching MiniCADaS (except geo-location)</p> <p>1.2.2 2027: Some beneficiary countries fully aligned with MiniCADaS and, where appropriate, alignment with CADaS</p>	<p>1.2.1 EaP RSO beneficiary countries, EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO data experts</p> <p>1.2.2 EaP RSO beneficiary countries, EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO data experts</p>	<p>Beneficiary countries fully collaborating</p> <p>Beneficiary countries have the technical equipment necessary for collection of all variables</p>
<p><b>Output 3 related Outcome 1</b></p> <p><b>to</b></p>	<p>1.3 Technologies for data collection to improve timeliness, accuracy, completeness, and relevance to policy formulation simplified and unified</p>	<p>1.3.1 Beneficiary countries show improvements in data collection, timeliness and accuracy</p> <p>1.3.2 Beneficiary countries show improvements in data storage and sharing</p>	<p>1.3.1 2021: All beneficiary countries with deficiencies in data collection</p> <p>1.3.2 2021: All beneficiary countries with deficiencies in data analysis and sharing</p>	<p>1.3.1 2027: All beneficiary countries show improvements in data collection</p> <p>1.3.2 2027: All beneficiary countries show evidence of data analysis for policy formation, and data sharing</p>	<p>1.3.1 EaP RSO beneficiary countries, EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO data experts</p> <p>1.3.2 EaP RSO Beneficiary countries, EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO data experts</p>	<p>Beneficiary countries fully collaborating</p> <p>Beneficiary countries have the technical equipment necessary for collection of all variables</p>

<p><b>Output related Outcome 1</b></p> <p><b>4 to</b></p>	<p>1.4 Local capacity within the host country/institution on crash data management/analysis strengthened and smooth operation of road safety observatory developed</p>	<p>1.4.1 Increased knowledge, skills and technical capacities within the host country/institution in relation to crash data management/analysis</p> <p>1.4.2 Capacity to manage operation of road safety observatory.</p> <p>1.4.3 Monitoring framework for the EaP RSO operation established</p>	<p>1.4.1 2021: No current expertise of host institution in road safety data</p> <p>1.4.2 2021: No specific experience of host institution of management of a road safety observatory</p> <p>1.4.3 2021: No monitoring framework in place</p>	<p>1.4.1 2023: Staff training in development of a common road safety database to be hosted by the Technical secretariat to be carried out</p> <p>1.4.2 2024: Experience of successful management of RSO to be assessed</p> <p>1.4.3 1 2024: Monitoring framework established</p>	<p>1.4.1 EaP RSO Beneficiary countries, EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO data experts</p> <p>1.4.2 EaP RSO Beneficiary countries, EaP RSO Technical Secretariat, EaP RSO data experts</p> <p>1.4.3 Reports on EaP RSO monitoring</p>	<p>Capacity to carry out necessary training not affected by pandemic (training conducted virtually)</p> <p>Reports issued on EaP RSO performance and achieved progress</p>
<p><b>Output related Outcome 1</b></p> <p><b>5 to</b></p>	<p>1.5 Road safety data and practices regularly communicated to a wider audience to encourage a safe system approach</p>	<p>1.5.1 Publication of an Annual Report by the EaP RSO</p> <p>1.5.2 Development of a EaP RSO website</p> <p>1.5.3 Development of a EaP RSO Communications strategy and communications monitoring</p>	<p>1.5.1 2021: No current Annual Reporting on road safety</p> <p>1.5.2 2021: No website</p> <p>1.5.3 2021: No communications outlets specific to the EaP RSO</p>	<p>1.5.1 2027: 6 Annual Reports published each year</p> <p>1.5.2 2023: Website developed and operational</p> <p>1.5.3 2023: Specific social media platforms for the EaP RSO</p>	<p>1.5.1 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat</p> <p>1.5.2 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat</p> <p>1.5.3 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat</p> <p>1.5.4 EaP RSO Technical Secretariat</p>	<p>Beneficiary countries fully collaborating</p> <p>Timely agreement on joint communications</p>

		1.5.4 Development of joint policy responses to common challenges	1.5.4 2021: No joint policy statements issued on specific road safety challenges	1.5.4 2027: Development of joint policy statements agreed by EaP RSO members		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## **4. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

### **4.1. Financing Agreement**

In order to implement this action, it is not envisaged to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country.

### **4.2. Indicative Implementation Period**

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 3 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 72 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this financing Decision.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this financing Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

### **4.3. Implementation Modalities**

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures<sup>20</sup>.

#### **4.3.1. Direct Management (Grants)**

##### **a) Purpose of the grant(s)**

The objective of the grant is to achieve outputs 1, 2, 3 and partially achieve outputs 4 and 5.

##### **b) Type of applicants targeted**

The type of applicants targeted are entities/NGOs established in the selected hosting country for the EaP RSO or a consortium of entities/NGOs, where at least one is established in the selected hosting country for the EaP RSO, with a strong knowledge and expertise in policy analysis, research, economic data analysis, standardisation, modelling, road safety policy, including management and analysis of road safety related data in the EaP partner countries. In addition, applicants and/or consortium of applicants must have experience in capacity building in crash-related priority variables, interconnectivity with other databases, and use of internet-based electronic databases, etc.

##### **(c) Justification of a direct grant**

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to an entity or consortium of entities which will be selected on grounds of their specific degree of technical competencies in the field of road safety policy and road safety-related data management or high degree of specialisation, strong proven operational experience in Eastern Partnership policies, road safety policy and road safety data management. The policy and implementation context for road safety data collection in the Eastern Partnership provides for a limited number of highly specialised and significantly competent beneficiaries in the very technical area of road safety.

---

<sup>20</sup> [www.sanctionsmap.eu](http://www.sanctionsmap.eu) Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

The recourse to such a direct award will be subject to fulfilling the conditions defined in Article 195 (f) of the 2018 Financial Regulation and will be considered on a case-by-case basis in the light of these requirements.

The implementing entity/consortium of entities will be selected using the following criteria:

- Demonstrated expertise in management and analysis of data, including road safety related data;
- Sound knowledge of the Eastern Partnership countries and the regional context;
- Proven experience in implementing similar actions/projects within the Eastern Partnership countries.

#### 4.3.2. Direct Management (Procurement)

The procurement will partially contribute to achieving outputs 1 and 4 as envisaged by the section 3. The proposed procurement of monitoring services through the framework contract links to the establishment of the monitoring framework foreseen under Output 4 and to the overall implementation of the action. The framework will focus in the proper performance and functioning of the EaP RSO, including if relevant its subsequent financial sustainability and development of an exit strategy, though recurrent assessment of progress, conduction of monitoring missions, data collection and reporting on results and issuing recommendations. This will contribute to improving quality and impact of the EU support, collecting good practices and recommending corrective measures if needed.

#### 4.4. Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply, subject to the following provisions.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of services in the markets of the countries or territories concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where application of the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult (Article 28(10) NDICI-Global Europe Regulation).

#### 4.5. Indicative Budget

<b>Indicative Budget components</b>	<b>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</b>
Grants (direct management) – cf. section 4.3.1	2 700 000
Procurement (direct management) – cf. section 4.3.2 Output 4 (partially)	300 000
<b>Grants</b> – total envelope under section 4.3.1	<b>2 700 000</b>
<b>Procurement</b> – total envelope under section 4.3.2	<b>300 000</b>
<b>Evaluation</b> – cf. section 5.2 <b>Audit</b> – cf. section 5.3	
<b>Communication and visibility</b> – cf. section 6	0

<b>Contingencies</b>	0
<b>Totals</b>	3 000 000

#### **4.6. Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities**

A Steering Committee shall be established for the project within the action to ensure coordination and complementarity of the different project activities. It will comprise representatives of the European Commission to ensure strategic guidance of the actions, with DG NEAR as contracting authority and DG MOVE for thematic guidance, as well as the main stakeholders in beneficiary countries and the EaP RSO hosting country, other interested parties as appropriate. The steering committee will meet at least once a year and on a case-by-case basis if such a necessity arises. Performance, monitoring and reporting, including in terms of visibility obligations, of the action will be undertaken in accordance with the signed agreement and will be presented by the selected entity during the Steering Committee meetings.

In addition, the designated entity in the EaP RSO hosting country will ensure regular exchanges and consultations where relevant with WHO, national regional road safety observatories in the EaP region, national administrations and agencies responsible for road safety, EU Delegations and other Commission services (geographical units/desks, Support Group for Ukraine, etc.) through a technical coordination mechanism. This will ensure that the implementation of the action is fully aligned with the national objectives but also strengthen project coordination processes to avoid risk of duplication of financing and overlap of activities, create synergies and complementarity between different actions and initiatives.

The action will seek synergies and complementarity with other actions implemented in the EaP countries, e.g. road safety twinnings in Georgia and Azerbaijan and the Armenia Road Safety Improvement Project, particularly regarding the communication and visibility campaign.

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action.

### **5. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

#### **5.1. Monitoring and Reporting**

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its Outputs and contribution to the achievement of its Outcomes, and if possible at the time of reporting, contribution to the achievement of its Impacts, as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix (for project modality).

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews). Performance measurement will be based on the intervention logic and the logframe matrix, including its indicators.

Roles and responsibilities for data collection, analysis and monitoring:

Each of the project activity is related to specific outcomes/outputs and equipped with quantified indicators and deliverables. Throughout the implementation, the achieved results will be checked against original activity plans and project deliverables set as milestones. Indicator-based reporting will be performed based on the logframe. Relevant indicators if appropriate may have to be disaggregated by country, geographic unit, age group, and gender. Where feasible, data specific for most vulnerable groups should be included.

The implementing partner will be responsible for the day-to-day execution and monitoring of the activities. In case of discrepancies, the project team will propose and introduce corrective measures. The normal procedure for eliminating discrepancies will be (a) recognition of discrepancy, (b) estimation of the level of discrepancy and potential impact (time, quantity and quality wise), (c) definition of reasons (internal and external), (d) preparation of a contingency plan (responsibilities, activities), (e) implementation of a contingency plan and (f) review.

DG NEAR will be regularly updated on progress made and any issues encountered. EU Delegations in beneficiary countries will be systematically informed of annual project work plans and on the progress of any bilateral activity within the project.

DG MOVE will be regularly consulted by NEAR and the implementing partner's project team on thematic issues. They will be invited to participate in Steering Committee meetings.

Regular internal reporting will be established at the onset of the project with all project stakeholders and will contribute to the overall project evaluation reporting. While the monitoring will be a constant process, at the key milestones of the project, internal evaluation will be implemented.

It is foreseen that the progress and work plan of the project will be monitored and discussed by a Steering Committee composed of the implementing partner and other implementing bodies if the case may be, the relevant road safety authorities of the beneficiary countries, and the European Commission services.

The action might be object of result-oriented monitoring (ROM) by the European Commission.

## **5.2. Evaluation**

Having regard to the importance of the action, a final evaluation may be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants. It may be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels (including for policy revision), taking into account in particular the fact the complexity of the action. In such case, the Commission shall form a Reference Group (RG) composed by representatives from the main stakeholders at both EU and national (representatives from the government, from civil society organisations (private sector, NGOs, etc.), etc.) levels. If deemed necessary, other donors will be invited to join. The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least 3 months in advance of the dates envisaged for the evaluation exercise and missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.



The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing Decision.

### **5.3. Audit and Verifications**

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audit or verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

## **6. STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY**

All entities implementing EU-funded external actions have the contractual obligation to inform the relevant audiences of the Union's support for their work by displaying the EU emblem and a short funding statement as appropriate on all communication materials related to the actions concerned. To that end they must comply with the instructions given in the [Communication and Visibility Requirements of 2018](#) (or any successor document).

This obligation will apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, the partner country, service providers, grant beneficiaries or entrusted or delegated entities such as UN agencies, international financial institutions and agencies of EU Member States. In each case, a reference to the relevant contractual obligations must be included in the respective financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

Any actions related to communication and visibility will be coordinated with the strategic communication actions of the EU Delegations, to ensure coherence of narrative and message, as well as horizontal strategic communication.