1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	2178
IA/EA Project ID	GFL-2328-2712-4921
Focal Area	Climate Change
Project Name	Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport in Latin America (PSTLA)
Country/Countries	Guatemala, Chile
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	UNEP Risoe Centre (URC), lead EA; Municipality of Guatemala city (MuniGuate); Undersecretariate of Transportation (SUBTRANS) & Inter-ministerial Secretariat of Transportation Planning for the Southern Region (SECTRA Sur)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 11: Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport
TER Prepared by	Joshua Schneck
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Kumar Negi
Author of TE	Angelica Castro
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	3/8/2006
Project Implementation Start Date	5/1/2006
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	4/1/2009
Actual Date of Project Completion	12/1/2009
TE Completion Date	10/1/2011
IA Review Date	N/A
TE Submission Date	8/30/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.03	0.03
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.01	0.01
Total Project Prep Financing	0.04	0.04
GEF Financing	0.96	0.96
IA/EA own	0.09	0.09
Government	1.32	0.71
Other*		
Total Project Financing	2.37	1.76
Total Financing including Prep	2.41	1.79

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MU	MU	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	ML	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	MU	MU	MU
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	MS	MS	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not Rated	MS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

According to the project appraisal document submitted for CEO endorsement, the project's overall objective is "to create the needed awareness and understanding of the benefits of sustainable transport project implementation among politicians, decision makers and stakeholders of the Latin American region, which may lead to the actual implementation of sustainable transport projects in the various countries of the region."

The expected principle impact is a contribution to increasing and sustained reductions in transport-sector GHG emissions from countries in the region.

No changes to the global environmental objectives of the project were noted in the TE or final PIR.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

The project logframe included in the appraisal document lists the following long-term development objective of the project:

"Replication of the three demonstration projects and/or the implementation of other regional transport projects addressing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Bus Regulation & Planning (BRP) and Non-Motorized Transport (NMT) in three other Latin American Cities. These cities will be identified and selected in the meeting to be held in conjunction with the final regional dissemination workshop."

According to the project appraisal document submitted for CEO endorsement, the project's immediate objective is "to improve mobility and reduce transport GHG emission in three cities

of the LA region. The project will also include activities to ensure dissemination of the three cities' activities across the broad Latin American region."

The project logframe included in the appraisal document lists the following immediate outcomes of the project:

* In Guatemala City, Guatemala: "Implementation and operation of the second corridor of Guatemala city's BRT system";

* In Panama City, Panama: "Implementation of Panama City's transport programme aimed at improving the regulation and planning of the bus system...";

* In Concepcion, Chile: "A behavioral change in Concepcion's inhabitants leading to a shift from private motorized to non-motorized transportation and to corresponding benefits."

Changes in the project, as documented in the project PIRs and terminal evaluation, are as follows: a decision was made to remove Panama City from the project after Panama's Executive Implementation agency for the project (ATTT) failed to initiate the planned actions. In the final year of the project, the Bus regulation and Planning project planned for Panama City was shifted to the city of Concepcion, Chile. Only one of the three demonstration projects (the non-motorized transport awareness campaign) was implemented during the project duration. This significantly changed the content, nature, and possible effectiveness of the workshops which were intended to showcase the achievements and lessons learned from the demonstration projects.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	Yes	Any other (specify to the right)
Project Components	Yes	The scope of the project activities were reduced due to a lack of progress
Other activities	No	

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance* – **Satisfactory**

This project was focused on improving the efficiency of public transportation systems in Latin America, and promoting the use of non-motorized transportation options. Therefore it is highly relevant to Operational Program 11 of the GEF - Promoting Environmentally sustainable Transport - as well run public transportation systems promise reduced GHG emissions, reduced emissions of local pollutants, and increased system-wide mobility. Moreover the project was designed with scalability in mind, as outputs of the project were intended to inform and encourage the development of sustainable transport projects beyond the sites where pilot projects were to be executed

Project outcomes are also relevant to the national priorities of the countries where project activities took place, as well as in other Latin American countries. Both Guatemala and Chile have cities with inefficient, inadequate, and poorly managed public transportation systems; poor local air quality; and significant and rising GHG emissions from transport giving rise to increased demand for sustainable transportation. Similar conditions and need are present in many other Latin American countries (Project Proposal document, pg 6). Guatemala City is implementing an "Urban Mobility Plan" which has as its goals a decrease in traffic congestion, decrease in local emissions and increased energy efficiency through the implementation of a bus rapid transit system. Chile's government is implementing plans for an "Integrated Transport System" which is to build upon the already constructed 21.4 km of bike lanes in Concepcion. In addition, the Executive Transport Secretariat of the Chilean Government (SECTRA), which is the Executing Agency for the non-motorized transport component of PSTLA, requested that the bus regulation and transport project be undertaken in Concepcion.

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Project outcomes differ significantly from expected outcomes. Only 1 of the 3 pilot projects was implemented during the project lifetime, and the failure to implement proper M&E limits the ability to assess the effectiveness of the non-motorized transport awareness campaign. No observable changes in GHG emissions or improvements in system-wide transport mobility occurred or are observable as a result of this project. As described in the terminal evaluation, and cross-checked against the Project Proposal document and final PIR, key differences in project outcomes and expectations are as follows:

* Facilitate and strengthen implementation of the second corridor (West Line) in Guatemala City's BRT system. As noted in the TE, all of the planned studies relating to the construction of this line were completed and the quality deemed adequate. However, construction of the intended line is indefinitely postponed and in its place a different line servicing another part of the city was constructed. While some of the studies were used in part to facilitate construction of the new line, not all were. Moreover, there is concern that in the case that actual construction of the planned West Line corridor takes place, the studies commissioned by this project will no longer be current (TE, pg. 46).

* Facilitate implementation of a transport program aimed at improving the planning and regulation of the urban bus system of Concepcion, Chile. This project was moved to the city of Concepcion in the last year of the project. At the time of the TE, guidelines for the concession of buses are still under review and the planning program as a whole has yet to be implemented. There is also concern that the completed studies are too general to be of much effectiveness in implementing the system (TE, pg 22).

* Design and implementation of a major information campaign aimed at promoting the wide-spread use of a planned 24 km bicycle lane. The evidence provided in the TE and PIR for the effectiveness of this campaign is anecdotal and fails to include measurement of the indicators

listed in the Project Proposal logframe. As such, benefits of the campaign are uncertain. The only evidence provided for project success includes a "30% increase in the sale of bikes and a 25% increase in bike-related activities." (TE, pg 26).

More successful were the activities relating to the development of training materials and conducting of workshops on developing sustainable transportation. According to the UNEP TM, " workshops and manual produced by the project were of great assistance in the development of new BRT/NMT projects not only in capital cities (e.g. Buenos Aires) but also in secondary cities (e.g. San Pedro Sula, Honduras)" (TE, pg 21). At the same time, this evidence is anecdotal, as acknowledged in the TE: "(t)here is no evidence that similar projects being developed in the region are a direct result of these activities." (TE, pg 25).

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

This project suffered from delays, a hastily executed transfer (TE, pg 27) of 1 of the 3 project implementation sites from Panama City to Concepcion, and the execution of only 1 of 3 demonstration projects, leading to an assessment of significant shortcomings in overall efficiency. More than half of the project timeline was dedicated towards administrative processes and contractual agreements - time that had originally been planned for project implementation. Much time and effort was spent trying to initiate the bus regulation project in Panama City, and the decision to shift the project to Concepcion in the last year of the project explains in part the limited progress in executing this project component. As the TE notes, 44% of GEF funds were used in project components that have yet to be fully implemented (TE, pg 28), and may never be in the case of Guatemala City. Moreover, there is concern that the study produced for Concepcion, Chile, on bus regulation and planning is too general to be of much use in implementing the project (TE, pg. 22).

Delays in implementing the project should have been anticipated and failure to do so had unfortunate consequences for the project. As the TE notes, in the 3 years separating design of the project (2003) from the beginning of project execution (2006) "Panama city completely lost interest in participating in this project, Guatemala City began construction of its first BRT system route without feasibility studies, and Concepcion constructed a network of bike paths in disjointed areas." (TE, pg 26).

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low/Moderate Risks**

An overall rating of moderate risks to sustainability is supported by the following assessment:

Socio-political risks: The 2010 national elections in Chile brought to power a government with a different economic ideology than the previous one. Some institutional knowledge was lost and both projects in Concepcion have remained inactive since the change in governments. However, the rating of moderate socio-policital risks is based on an assessment that strong

demand exists for sustainable transport in the two cities and wider region, and government commitment is evidenced by plans for additional bike lanes in Concepcion, Chile, recent expansion of the Transmetro system in Guatemala City, and desire on the part of the Chilean Government to increase the efficiency of its bus system, which is subsidized by the Government. (TE, pg 31).

Financial sustainability: Moderate risks to financial sustainability as the BRT project in Concepcion, involving implementation of prepaid fare cards on buses, requires a large capital investment to create a network of stations where customers can add value to their cards. As the TE notes, "(a)n investment of the size required for the provision of the network would imply a significant increase in either fares or Government subsidies."(TE, pg 33). Both the Transmetro system in Guatemala City and the Bicycle network require continous allocation of Governmental funds to cover operational funding gaps. However, assistance for both does not seem to be at risk given recent expansions of the Transmetro system and the construction of more bicycle lanes in the respective cities.

Institutional framework and governance: Moderate risks to sustainability stemming from a need for better coordination among National and local governments in both Chile and Guatemala.

Environmental risks: The February 2010 earthquake in Chile partially destroyed the transportation network in Concepcion, including the bicycle paths. Guatemala City is also in a high-risk area for volcanic eruption, with the most recent eruption occurring in May 2010. Despite these risks, we can infer that the limited environmental benefits realized by this project are likely to be sustained due to wide and continuous dissemination of project guidebooks, and the participation of regional practitioners, development organizations, and the private sector in the project's workshops (TE pg 21).

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. *Co-financing*

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Unable to fully assess for the following reasons:

Final financial reports were requested by the TE but were never delivered. As such, actual co-financing realized may be larger than what is reported in the TE. No realization of $3.2 million in expected co-financing is reported for the Non-Motorized Transport campaign in Concepcion, Chile. This project was arguably the most successful of the three planned pilot projects as it was the only pilot project fully implemented during the course of the project. Reported co-financing is low for Guatemala City (23% of planned co-financing), however TE notes that development funds from the IADB for a closely related project in the area were used in part to cover some costs expected to be

covered by the local municipality (TE, pg 41). Reported co-financing for the BRP project was highest, at 78%, however this project has yet to be fully executed.

Funding for the execution of pilot projects does not appear to have been well integrated into the project, as only 1 of the three planned pilot projects was actually executed over the course of the project. This meant that resources allocated towards planning studies were not used effectively, as the output of these studies becomes less relevant over time (TE, pg 42).

6.1.2. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Unable to access as final financial reports showing degree of realized co-financing were never delivered.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

TE notes that the three year gap from when demonstration cities were identified (2003) to actual project implementation (2006) was detrimental to the achievement of the project's goals. By the time the project began Panama City had already conducted 8 of the 12 studies originally included in the project and was no longer interested in participating in the project, and the City of Concepcion had completed its first phase of 24 km bike paths in a disjointed manner (TE, pg 38). Moreover, according to the TE, the project had an unrealistic time schedule for implementing the projects, as "projects of this magnitude can take at least 3 to 4 years, and the results are often not accurately observed immediately after their completion." (TE, pg 38). This may partially explain why only 1 of the 3 demonstration projects has been implemented at the time of project completion. The project's completion date was extended by 8 months as a result of project activities being moved mid-project from Panama City, Panama, to Concepcion, Chile.

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. 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:

Country ownership appears relatively strong in the case of the non-motorized transport campaign in Chile. TE notes continued demand for increased bicycle infrastructure and plans on the part of the national and local governments to expand bicycle lanes (TE, pg

40). Country ownership in Guatemala City of the project was not sufficient to overcome a lack of coordination between local municipalities in Guatemala City (TE, pg 40). A greater investment in project outcomes on the part of the national government may have been successful in pushing this project along. Although the BRP project in Concepcion is yet to be executed, it is the assessment of the GEF evaluator (Josh Schneck) that country ownership is the bus regional planning and regulation project is sufficient given the late shift of this project component to Concepcion, Chile, and the continuing advancement of the pilot project.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Significant shortcomings in the design of the project's M&E at entry include: (1) lack of sufficient indicators to allow the project to be monitored at all stages of the project. Indicators shown in PD Logframe are for outcomes of demonstration projects whose implementation is largely outside the control of the Implementing Agency; and (2) absence of any identified methodology for evaluating reductions in GHG emissions. Funding for M&E was included in the project management budget.

7.2. *M&E implementation* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Major shortcomings in the M&E plan implementation include: (1) Projects were initiated without first establishing a baseline, as called for in the PD Logframe (PD, Pg. 50). (2) Failure to account for how, if at all, any of the budgeted GEF funding for M&E was applied. Total GEF funding for M&E totals $120,000. (3) Indicators used for measuring the outcome of the non-motorized transport project - a reported change in bicycle sales in the city of Concepcion and the new presence in the local marketplace of bikes for female riders - is far removed from actual desired outcomes (increased NMT travel, reduced traffic congestion, reduced local GHG emissions).

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation* - **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The overall quality of implementation is moderately unsatisfactory. Factors leading to this assessment include weaknesses in the project design. The project design timetable for implementing demonstration projects proved to be overly optimistic. The project design also failed to ensure adequate commitment of all local partners, in this case Panama, which was dropped from the project midway through its completion. Finally, the project design failed to identify appropriate indicators for all stages of project implementation to allow for effective M&E.

The TE notes that more active participation of UNEP would have been "extremely helpful" in this project as it would have encouraged the use of adequate environmental monitoring (TE pg 43).

The large distance separating the UNEP Task Manager from the site activities may have be a factor in limiting the success of this project.

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* - **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Executing agency (URC) was successful in delivering all but one of the planned activities and studies (delivery of external audit in Guatemala City is still pending). Produced guidelines available at (www.nestlac.org) appear to be of high quality. However, overall assessment of quality of execution is moderately unsatisfactory because:

* Administration and monitoring of financial statements was disorganized (TE, pg 47), and final financial statements were unavailable at time of TE.

* Project supervision and monitoring by URC (based in Denmark) was removed from the project and not consistent throughout project cycle. (TE, pg 43).

* Project failed to follow proper M&E procedures, limiting the ability to assess outcomes and impacts.

* TE notes that PIR was the main monitoring tool for the project, but in some cases, project milestones were reported prior to being completed (TE, pg 43).

While 2 of 3 pilot projects were not implemented during project timeframe, this was outside the control of the executing agency.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	The report is strong in terms of assessing relevant outcomes and impacts. The report could benefit from a more thorough explanation of how financing was applied and where information is lacking and in need of follow-up.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	The report is internally consistent and assessments are substantiated. The report could have presented project outputs and indicators more clearly in a table.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Satisfactory**	Report makes reasonable assumptions regarding the sustainability of limited project outcomes. More information on the status of the BRT and BRP projects, and country commitment to seeing those project through, would have been helpful.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Satisfactory**	Lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented. More information on the reasons for Panama being withdrawn from the project would have been helpful. TE implies that governmental or administrative changes in Panama were contributing factors to Panama's failure to initiate project activities, but no additional information is given (TE, pg 10). Also would have been helpful to understand the role and contribution of NESTLAC to delivery of project outputs and outcomes. TE notes that NESTLAC was integral to the workshops as dissemination of guidelines, however nothing is said about any role NESTLAC may have had in facilitating actual implementation of demonstration projects. This is notable given that the PD document envisions a more substantial role for NESTLAC in this regard: "NESTLAC will be key not only in the process of dissemination and awareness creation, but also in assisting in the actual implementation of the demonstration projects being proposed here." (PD, pg 7).
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Moderately Unsatisfactory**	Report does not include full accounting of actual project costs and actual co-financing used. TE notes that this information was not available at the time of the TE (TE, pg 41). Presentation of financing information and discussion is inadequate to facilitate full review.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Highly Satisfactory**	The report clearly details the significant limitations of the projects M&E systems.

10. Other issues to follow up on

Final financial reports were requested by TE from URC and local agencies but could not be obtained during evaluation period. A review of how GEF funds were allocated was not possible and therefore requires follow-up. As the TE notes, $95,578 of GEF funds have yet to be accounted for (TE, pg 27).

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved? Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Three dissemination workshops for regional practitioners; development and publication of 3 planning and implementation guides corresponding to the project's 3 focal areas (non-motorized transport, bus regulation and planning, rapid bus transport); 3 planning studies done to facilitate implementation of sustainable transport demonstration projects in Guatemala City and Concepcion.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance? Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

There is evidence that part of the studies for the rapid bus transit implementation project in Guatemala City were used by the city's municipal planning agency in the development of a different line. According to the TE, planning studies allowed officials to (1) gauge demand for travel in the western part of the city; (2) submit that project for CDM approval; and (3) in planning two overpasses along Calzada Roosevelt at 36th and 39th Avenues, and in the implementation of reversible lanes (TE, pg 22). There is also anecdotal evidence that the published guides and workshops were of assistance in the development of similar sustainable projects in the region (TE, pg 21). However, no evidence is given for the latter beyond the word of the UNEP TM (TE, pg 21).

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Three sustainable transport development guides are publically available on an established site - the Network for Environmentally Sustainable Transport in Latin America and the Caribbean (www.nestlac.org).

Is there evidence that these outputs were used? Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

As mentioned above, there is anecdotal evidence that the published guides and workshops were of assistance in the development of similar sustainable projects in the region. The anecdotal evidence is the opinion of the UNEP TM, upon interacting with the participants in the project's regional workshops (TE, pg 21).

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised? Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Design and implementation of a public awareness campaign promoting non-motorized transport in Concepcion, Chile. Three dissemination workshops for regional practitioners; development and publication of 3 planning and implementation guides corresponding to the project's 3 focal areas (non-motorized transport, bus regulation and planning, rapid bus transport); 3 planning studies done to facilitate implementation of sustainable transport demonstration projects in Guatemala City and Concepcion.

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities? Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

TE reports that the campaign to promote non-motorized cycling in Concepcion *"managed to change the perception of cycling and inspire the interest of retailers to serve the female market. The campaign also earned the attention of the national government, which presented a bill for Congress to promote cycling in Chile."* (TE, pg 45). However, evidence of the former is entirely lacking, and uncertain in the latter case as it's impossible to know if the bill promoting cycling in Chile would have been introduced in absence of the project.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills? Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO ***TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS*** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

Three dissemination workshops for regional practitioners; development and publication of 3 planning and implementation guides corresponding to the project's 3 focal areas; 3 planning studies done to facilitate implementation of sustainable transport demonstration projects in Guatemala City and Concepcion.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained? No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks? No

Were these adopted? No

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures? No

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures? No

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

No

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

No

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

No

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION? WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	Publication of 3 planning and implementation guides on sustainable transport systems.
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	
Financial Mechanisms	No	

Did r**eplication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

UA

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Unable to access as no information documenting the use of the produced guidelines for the replication of similar projects in other cities of the region is provided. The project logframe calls for the collection of such evidence *"through solicitation of testimonials and by incorporation of recommendations from the guidelines into other projects, to the extent this can be documented during the duration of this project."* The only testimonial on the possible impact of these studies comes from the UNEP TM, who notes that workshops and manuals produced by the project were of great assistance in the development of new BRT/NMT projects in the region, including Buenos Aires, Argentina, and San Pedro sula, Honduras. (TE, pg 21).

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.
HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did r**emoval of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Combination *<--dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

Knowledge & Information & Implementation Strategies *<--dropdown menu*

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved? No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

☐ Local	☐ Intended (local)	☐ Unintended (local)
☐ Systemic	☐ Intended (systemic)	☐ Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? ☐ Measured ☐ Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status? No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

☐ Local ☐ Intended (local) ☐ Unintended (local)

☐ Systemic ☐ Intended (systemic) ☐ Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? ☐ Measured ☐ Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental No

Socioeconomic | No

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts? | No

If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply		
	☐ Local	☐ Intended (local)	☐ Unintended (local)
	☐ Systemic	☐ Intended (systemic)	☐ Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	☐ Measured	☐ Anecdotal	

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts? No

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

Key lessons from this project are as follows:
(1) Commitment shown by participants during the design stage of a project may not carry forward to actual project implementation, particularly in cases where there is a change in government or administrative changes between project identification and implementation. This was the case in Panama City, which was dropped from the project.
(2) Project timeframes need to be based on a clear assessment of the time required to complete project objectives, allowing for administrative delays which are common in some Latin American countries.
(3) Effective M&E plans include development of appropriate indicators for all project stages, development of a baseline, and identification of methodologies for measurement of environmental indicators (in this case, GHG emissions and local air pollution).
(4) Failure to integrate all of the financing required for key project components - here the financing for implementation of three demonstration projects - can limit project performance in cases where successful outcomes depend upon the coordinated execution of all key project components.
(5) Effective oversight and monitoring is best achieved through direct and sustained observation of project activities throughout the project cycle (TE, pg 44 and 47).

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Recommendations are:
(1) UNEP may wish to ensure that commitments by local counterparts are supported by contracts that clearly establish timelines for project implementation, and include penalty clauses in case of contract breech.
(2) In cases where the Lead Executing agency is removed from the project, incorporation of a technical partner, possibly an NGO, may facilitate more effective monitoring and implementation of project components (TE, pg 48).
(3) Proper attention and priority needs to be given to M&E to ensure effective oversight and evaluation. That includes establishing a baseline, developing clear and appropriate indicators for all stages of a project, and conducting monitoring. Contracts should clearly define responsibilities for undertaking these activities.
(4) Project financing, to the degree possible, should integrate and include funding for all components that are key to successful project outcomes. In this case, that included funding for implementation of pilot projects.
(5) Final evaluations should be delayed in cases where project outcomes are in an early stage of maturation.