

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2014	
GEF Agency project ID		2841	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Incorporating Non-Motorized (NMT) Transport Facilities in the City of Gaborone	
Country/Countries		Botswana	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 11: Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport	
Executing agencies involved		Gaborone City Council	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		I-Ce (Interface for Cycling Expertise)	
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		05/24/2005	
Effectiveness date / project start		09/05/2005	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		08/30/2009	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2010	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.89	0.84
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	1.3653	0.698
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.92	0.86
Total Co-financing		1.37	0.70
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.28	1.56
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 9, 2012	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Krishna Pal	
TER completion date		11/23/2015	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	NR	NR	NR	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	MS	NR	ML
M&E Design	NR	NR	NR	MU
M&E Implementation	NR	NR	NR	U
Quality of Implementation	NR	MU	NR	MU
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	NR	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objective is to mitigate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the urban transport sector by enhancing a modal shift from motorized transport to non-motorized transport (NMT). The transport sector in Botswana is growing rapidly and is already a significant source of GHG emissions. In addition, continued growth in the use of motorized transport has related social and environmental consequences that include traffic congestion, accidents and air pollution (PD pg. 2). The shift to NMT will be brought about through the construction of a safe and convenient network of pedestrian and cycling pathways and related infrastructure for bicycles, promotion and communication/public awareness campaign and review of the policy and legal framework (PD pg. 11).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective is to promote incorporation of NMT modes in urban areas of Botswana and the region (PD pg.24). The project will address the institutional, cultural, and financial barriers that currently limit the use of NMT modes of transport, with the intention of increasing safety for all road users; improving accessibility to transport for low income and disadvantaged groups; reducing traffic congestion; and reducing environmental costs (air, noise, and lead pollution) (PD pg. 11).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

Outcome 1, *Transport-based greenhouse gas emissions reduced*, was removed during the inception phase of the program and replaced with the following outcome: *Learning, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management* (TE pg. 11).

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF’s climate change focal area. Replacing motorized transport with NMT modes of transport is expected to result in a reduction of transport energy demand, therefore would limit greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution from the transport sector. The project is also directly relevant to GEF’s Operational Program Number 11, *Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport* (PD p. 4).

The project is also consistent with Botswana’s country priorities. As a signatory to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Botswana is seeking opportunities to implement measures that will benefit both national development and the environment. In addition, the project is consistent with Botswana’s Vision 2016, which supports the incorporation of road safety features, including pedestrian and cycle tracks (PD pg. 3-4). The project also contributes to Millennium Development Goal 7, *Environmental Sustainability/Sustainable Use of Environmental Resources* (TE pg. i).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE rates “progress toward achieving project objectives” as marginally unsatisfactory. This TER provides an equivalent rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project effectiveness. The project failed to achieve key outputs and outcomes necessary for enhancing a modal shift from MT to NMT, such as constructing viable NMT infrastructure in the city of Gaborone. In addition, there is no indication that there has been an increase in uptake of cycling or walking. These shortcomings prevented the achievement of both the Global Environment and Development objectives. However, the project met expectations in a few areas, particularly in increasing the institutional capacity of GCC to design NMT infrastructure and adapting legal frameworks to accommodate NMT. A summary of the achievement of results is provided below:

- **Revised Outcome 1- Learning, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management:**

- **Outcome 2- Well designed and constructed NMT network of cycle/walkways and bicycle facilities:**

20 km of new cycle and pedestrian track was designed and there were limited improvements to existing NMT infrastructure. However no new infrastructure has been created (TE pg. 25). The NMT infrastructure in place is disconnected (TE pg. 21).

- **Outcome 3- Increased uptake of NMT (cycling and walking) as a means of transport:**
There is no evidence indicating that there has been an increase in uptake of cycling and walking. However, a NMT campaign was undertaken and a number of NMT events were held which resulted in an increased in public awareness of NMT (TE pg. 28).
- **Outcome 4- Informed and equipped institutional framework for NMT:**
A NMT unit was established at GCC and stakeholder advisory groups were created with limited functionality (TE pg. 3).
- **Outcome 5- Conducive policy and legal framework for NMT:**
The government of Botswana has included NMT in their draft Integrated Transport Policy. The GCC revised the Gaborone City Development Plan to include provisions for walkways and cycle routes for all new city roads (TE pg. 28).
- **Outcome 6- Improvement to quality of life:** NMT initiatives have generated limited employment opportunities, however there is no indication that NMT has reduced traffic congestion, pedestrian/cyclist accidents, or pollution (TE pg. 4).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------	--

The TE does not provide an overall rating for efficiency, however it found that the project was “highly uneconomical in terms of the cost of GHGs mitigation” (TE pgs. 5). The project was scheduled to begin in June 2005, however the inception phase was not completed until December 2006 due to delays in hiring a project manager and bureaucratic challenges with the executing agency, the Ministry of Local Government. The original project completion date was subsequently revised from August 30, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

Key components of the project (NMT Project Facility Design; Promotion and Communication; and Policy and Legal Framework Reviews) were implemented by various government, non-governmental, and private sector organizations. The implementation of these components was intended to be coordinated by a Project Steering Committee with technical advice from a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and input from a Stakeholders Consultative Forum (SCF). Although the TE found the TAG and SCF to be largely non-functional, it did find there to be sufficient coordination between the various stakeholders (TE pg. 3).

Non-availability of funds for infrastructure development significantly impacted the achievement of key outputs and outcomes. Only 36% of the GEF budget for NMT facility design and construction was used

for that activity due to overspending for other activities, including NMT public awareness campaigns, support studies and study tours (TE pg. 21). In addition, only 45% of the co-finance expenditure for NMT facility design and construction was realized (TE pg. 23). Cost-effectiveness was limited by a lack of reliable cost estimates and feasibility studies (TE pg. 18).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rates Sustainability as **Marginally Satisfactory**. This TER, which uses a different scale, revises it to **Moderately Likely**.

Financial Resources

This TER finds the sustainability of financial resources to be **Moderately Likely**. New NMT infrastructure was not constructed during the life cycle of the project, and it is unclear whether there will be funding available in the future for this key initiative. However, the GCC has mandated the integration of NMT into all new road construction projects, including an annual budget for the maintenance of pedestrian and cycle pathways.

Sociopolitical

This TER finds the sociopolitical sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**. The government of Botswana has demonstrated its commitment to the project, and officials from other localities have shown interest in replicating the project (TE pg. 29). Public awareness of NMT has increased, however there remains a perception that cycle users are poor which may be affecting uptake of NMT (TE pg. 7).

Institutional Framework and Governance

This TER finds the sustainability of the institutional framework and governance to be **Likely**. Institutional frameworks such as the Gaborone City Master Plan and the Draft National Integrated Transport Policy now include provisions for NMT (TE pg. 27). In addition, the institutional capacity of the implementing partners such as the GCC, Department of Roads, police and estate developers has increased due to the project (TE pg. 28).

Environmental

There is insufficient information in the TE to assess Environmental Sustainability.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Expected co-financing was US \$1,365,300, however only 49% (\$698,000) was realized by the end of the project. It is unclear from the TE why the actual level of co-financing differed so drastically from the expected level. The lack of materialization of co-financing significantly affected the achievement of key outputs and outcomes, particularly the construction of a NMT network of cycle/walkways and subsequently, an uptake in NMT as a means of transport.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was delayed by 15 months during the project startup, and the completion date was extended from August 30, 2009 to June 30, 2010. The delay was due to challenges hiring a project manager and bureaucratic obstacles in the Ministry of Local Government. The TE notes that the design of the NMT infrastructure facilities wasn't awarded until 2009 and the design report was received after the completion of the project (TE p. 20). This, along with reduced co-financing, adversely affected the construction of the NMT infrastructure cycle/walkways.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The high level of country ownership is evident through the co-financing of the project by government; the establishment of a NMT unit within the GCC; and amended key institutional frameworks. Furthermore, the project is in line with Botswana's commitments as a signatory to the UNFCCC and its national development priorities under Vision 2016. Country ownership is likely to positively affect potential sustainability.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE does not assess the quality of the M&E design at entry. However, there are noticeable shortcomings in the M&E design. Funding for monitoring (US \$60,000) and evaluation (US \$50,000) was dedicated during the design phase. However, the M&E plan is vague on the M&E activities that would be implemented. Four evaluations were scheduled to take place over the course of the program, which is impractical given the funding allocated. The PD states that “to reduce the cost of the evaluations, a system of regular monitoring, such as regular traffic counts on the NMT routes will become the responsibility of the GCC” (pg. 23). However, again, the M&E plan does not specify how this system would operate and how the data collected would be used to inform programming. Although a project implementation schedule is provided it does not include specific M&E activities.

The causal links in the logframe are logical, however the indicators included at entry are not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely). For example, indicators include “student and important persons included in promotional events,” and “reduced traffic congestion” (PD pg. 25). Baseline values and targets were not included.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating on the quality of M&E implementation. The TE does note in the recommendation section that the “non-availability of monitoring and evaluation data for key performance parameters has put the project at higher risk” (TE pg. 35). This TER concurs, as it appears from reviewing the available PIRs that little monitoring data was collected over the life of the program. It does not appear that any training or guidance was provided to the GCC, which was responsible collecting data. This, combined with an absence of quality indicators at entry, likely contributed to the lack of a functioning M&E system.

A baseline survey was conducted on NMT transport facilities in Gaborone in December 2007, however it does not appear that these findings were incorporated into the M&E framework. In addition, follow-up surveys were not conducted to track progress toward program objectives (TE pg. 25). A midterm evaluation was conducted, however the TE found many of the recommendations were not implemented (TE pg. 33).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Marginally Unsatisfactory** for Project Implementation, which this TER revises to an equivalent **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. There were flaws in the design of the project, including overly ambitious objectives, a poor M&E plan and an unrealistic timeline. The PD anticipated 6-12 months for the design of the NMT infrastructure, when in reality the design was not completed until the end of the project in 2010 (TE pg. 20). The 2008 PIR reported that there was a lack of skills on NMT development within the country which led to delays in the implementation of the project (pg. 26), which was not anticipated during the design phase. The quality of supervision and assistance from UNDP is unclear from the TE or other documentation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for project execution, however this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. There were significant delays in hiring a project manager which affected the project timeline. In addition, the NMT unit within the GCC was chronically understaffed. The midterm evaluation found that the project manager, assistant and part-time staff (traffic officer and economists) were insufficient to execute the project, however this was not addressed (TE pg. 4).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There were no environmental changes cited in the TE.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There were no socioeconomic changes cited in the TE.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE notes that as a result of participation in the project the GCC, Road and Traffic departments, private developers, and contractors now have the capacity to design, develop, operate and maintain NMT systems (pg. 30). In particular, GCC road engineers are able to identify deficiencies in the NMT systems and undertake corrective action (pg. 28).

In addition, the TE notes that public awareness of the socio-economic, health, energy, and environmental benefits of NMT has increased (pg. 28) as a result of workshops, study tours and publicity campaign. 17 people from key stakeholder organizations were trained on safe cycling skills (pg. 27). Lastly, Limited NMT infrastructure has been improved in Gaborone, including cycle lanes with signage and pedestrian facilities (pg. 25).

b) Governance

The TE notes that as a result of this project, the government of Botswana has adopted NMT into their draft Integrated Transport Policy and the GCC revised the Gaborone City Development Plan to include provisions for walkways and cycle routes for all new city roads (TE pg. 27-28).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

There were no unintended impacts cited in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There are no initiatives that have been replicated or scaled up by the project’s end. However, the TE does note that there are indications that other district and town councils in Botswana are

planning their own NMT infrastructure. Officials in Francistown have shown interest in replicating the project and the Lobatse town council developed 7km of NMT facilities as a result of their participation in a training (TE pg. 29).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE states the following lessons learned (TE pg. 35-36):

- NMT has to be integrated in Gaborone city planning and transport development strategies. The main constraints for acceptance of NMT by people are: high atmospheric temperature/heat due to sun, non-availability of long route mass transit system, non-identification of potential short routes, non-availability of en-route bicycle repair and maintenance facilities, parking and garage and bath facilities. NMT infrastructure should only be developed on specific routes connecting the mass transit system or near the schools based on public consultation and traffic surveys before start of the project.
- There is a requirement for change in mind set to encourage use of NMT and transit system. The awareness campaign, events, guides and volunteers on road crossings may change attitudes toward NMT. The vehicle occupancy ration is low. There is nothing to encourage a modal shift from MT to NMT. The government is slow in implementing cycle initiative. Bicycles in schools could be used as sport and mode of transport. Organizations may encourage use of bicycle by contributing half of the bicycle cost. The Botswana government may send cycling team to participate in international sports events.
- Requests for projects for financing are not always accompanied by feasibility studies/detailed project reports since such studies are generally prepared only after funding is secured. This practice however adversely affected the project quality at entry due to non-availability of studies, the gaps in database, reliability of cost estimates and basic technical details. Such data gaps and lacunae have led to the setting up of unrealistic targets for project milestones at appraisal. For example, the design of NMT facilities was completed at the end of the project in June 2010 which should have been complete in the first year (by August 2007) of the project. On a few occasions, it has changed the project configuration, leading to delays.
- Appointment of staff, effective formulation of committees and sensitization of stakeholders on project procedures prior to commencement of project implementation is a pre-requisite to reduce-/- avoid delays observed at the start and during the implementation of NMT project.
- The awareness campaigns, study tours and physical implementation of NMT project should have been taken simultaneously to achieve the objectives.
- Road laws for cycling need to be more covered. Funds should be earmarked for NMT activities in the Government budget. The intersection at road crossing should be cycle friendly.

- The participation of women in city safe cycle training and organized events is very low (about 8%). Campaign should be conducted from start of the project through targeted activities for women for their involvement in NMT activities.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE states the following recommendations (TE pg. 34-35):

- Progress has been made to increase public awareness about NMT. However it would have been appropriate to be more targeted specific events in an area and groups of the society. Botswana may participate in cycling events in the International Games / events for generating interest in NMT.
- The success of the project is dependent on the completion of design and construction of NMT facilities. The identification of NMT routes and design of infrastructure was very slow. The routes and infrastructure facilities shall be identified and fridge at the time of project Proposal/appraisal.
- The monitoring and evaluation of key indicators shall be identified at appraisal and need to be monitored on a regular basis so that intermittent performance evaluation could be conducted and timely corrective actions could be taken to achieve the objectives and outcomes.
- The Government of Botswana would need to provide continuous support for NMT infrastructure and its integration with mass rapid transit system (MRTS) to reduce GHGs and may lead to earn carbon credit through clean development mechanism (CDM).
- The UNDP/GEF assistance is project based. In order to have an integrated development impact in the country/city, it should shift from the project based approach to Sector Wide Approach (SWA) in the city transport sectors.
- Development of SMEs for local fabrication, manufacturing of cycle, instruments, and equipment used in cycle repair and maintenance will develop capacity at the private sector level. This will also reduce dependence and availability problems with imported parts.
- There is a need for aid co-ordination between various agencies through a common framework at the GOB level. A coordinated approach for project implementation, aid co-ordination and co-financing will bring international agencies on a common platform for better results.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the	The report assesses the relevant project outcomes and achievement of objectives. The evaluator notes that it is difficult to assess impacts as the objectives were not	MS

project and the achievement of the objectives?	achieved, however the report could have discussed potential impacts.	
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and the evidence provided to is complete.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report's assessment of sustainability could have been more complete. For example, it does not discuss sociopolitical or environmental sustainability.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used. However, the actual project costs do not include the costs for evaluation and replication which is misleading.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report did not evaluate the project M&E systems.	HU
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources of information were used.