

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2876	
GEF Agency project ID		87630	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Grant for Ouagadougou Transport Modal Shift Project	
Country/Countries		Burkina-Faso	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment (Direction Générale de l'Amélioration du Cadre de Vie, DGACV)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None given	
Private sector involvement		None given	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 22, 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 27, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2013	
Actual date of project completion		June 30, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.025	.025
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		.88	NA
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	.05	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	12.9	NA
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		.91	.68
Total Co-financing		13.04	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		13.92	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		6/30/2015	
Author of TE		Pierre Guislain	
TER completion date		6.3.2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)			

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	NR	UA
M&E Design	NR	NR	MU
M&E Implementation	NR	NR	UA
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	UA
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	NR	NR	U

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project document does not state explicitly global environmental objectives, but notes that the project will “result in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. A further benefit of the project is an improved urban environment through a reduction of gasoline consumption and related ambient air pollutants.” (PD 2007 p.4)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s development objective is “to establish a policy environment conducive to encouraging a shift in transport mode from individual to public transport in the city of Ouagadougou.” (PD 2007 p.4)

This would be established through two project components funded by the GEF:

- 1) Clear institutional framework, a developed strategy and related investment plan enabling a shift from individual to public transport
- 2) Strengthened capacity of stakeholders and transport institutions to improve transport efficiency;

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

No changes in objectives or activities are listed in the TE, PIRs, or other documents.

## 4. GEF IEO 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

Relevance is not rated in the TE. This TER rates relevance as Satisfactory. The project was in line with a number of the government of Burkina Faso’s strategies, specifically its transport sector strategy, Poverty Reduction Strategy, and the phase out of leaded gasoline, which it committed to through the Clean Air Initiative for Sub-Saharan Africa (CAI-SSA). The project is in line with GEF OP.11- Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport and with Strategic Priority CC-5- promoting sustainable innovative systems for urban transport.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not rate effectiveness but rated progress towards achieving objectives as moderately satisfactory. This TER rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory as project components were delivered satisfactorily. This project was designed as a pilot, and based on the evidence provided it appears that it was effective in designing measures to encourage users toward collective transport, specifically using line 3 of the SOTRACO public transport buses. Unfortunately the indicator on reduction in total direct tonnage of CO2 avoided as a result of the project was not reported on, thus effectiveness towards this goal cannot be assessed. Achievements under each project component are listed below:

**Clear institutional framework, a developed strategy and related investment plan enabling a shift from individual to public transport.** The TE notes that decrees clarifying the roles of different actors were signed, and that a new agency, the Urban Transport Organizing Authority (AOTU) was set up for policy guidance in the field of urban transport.

**Strengthened capacity of stakeholders and transport institutions to improve transport efficiency.** Staff in institutions responsible for transport policy and transport management have benefited from training on traffic and pollution management. 100% of physical investment planned by the project was completed, specifically terminuses, bus shelters, and road signage. The TE reports a 51% rate of increase in passenger ridership on the Sotraco line affected by the project, compared to other lines.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: UA
-----------------------	------------

This TER is unable to assess efficiency, as no information is provided in the TE. The TE does rate financial management as moderately unsatisfactory, and notes that there were many delays in providing reports, and mistakes in DRFs. A consultant was hired to support the team in finalizing documents.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: UA
---------------------------	------------

No information on sustainability is provided in the TE, thus this TER is unable to assess 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?

The government of Burkina Faso committed \$50,000 in co-financing, however information is not available on whether or not this co-financing was realized.

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 TE notes that project closure was extended to June 2015.

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:

No information on country ownership is available.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE does not rate M&E Design at Entry. This TER rates it as moderately unsatisfactory, as the majority of indicators in the M&E plan are not actual indicators but rather results, and are not measurable or verifiable. Additionally, the M&E plan does not include a dedicated budget for M&E (the project document notes that M&E funds are included in the operating costs for the implementing agency in response to earlier comments from the GEF Secretariat), or an explanation of how M&E responsibilities will be shared among project partners.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: UA
-----------------------------------	------------

The TE rates M&E as moderately satisfactory, noting that with a new coordinator project reporting has improved. This TER is unable to assess M&E implementation as no information is provided in the TE or other project documents.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Unable to Assess
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------

Beyond noting implementation difficulties the TE does not discuss quality of project implementation, thus this TER is unable to assess it.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------------	--------------------------

The TE notes project progress was very slow, “with back and forth due to weak quality of documents and limited capacity of the project management team.” (TE p.6) The 2013 PIR notes the same, and that hands on support from the bank team has helped improve the PMU’s capacity. Beyond this, and noting delays in providing financial reports, no information on quality of project execution is provided, thus this TER is unable to assess it.

## 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.

The project successfully increased passenger ridership on a public bus line, which would likely lead to CO2 emissions avoided. Unfortunately the project did not report against this indicator, thus this project is unable to assess the environmental change brought about by the project. (TE p.4)

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.

No information is available on socioeconomic changes as a result of the project.

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 “key staff of the institutions responsible for transport policy and transport management have benefited from training on traffic and pollution management.” (TE p.5)

b) Governance

The TE notes that a new agency, the Urban Transport Organizing Authority (AOTU) was set up as a result of the project. (TE p.5)

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.

No unintended impacts are noted.

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.

No adoption at scale is noted in the TE or other documents.

## 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.

Lessons learned are not provided by the TE.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendations are not provided by the TE.

## 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 IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report is a GRM and provides very limited information on project's outcomes, impacts and achievement of objectives.	<b>U</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	As stated before very little information is provided, additionally not all relevant ratings are provided.	<b>U</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	No real discussion of sustainability and exit strategy is provided.	<b>U</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	No discussion of lessons learned is provided.	<b>U</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report contains totals by component, though not by activity, and contains no co-financing information.	<b>MU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides a rating of M&E as a whole as moderately unsatisfactory, and notes that project status reports were written and submitted on time. There is not enough information to assess M&E	<b>MU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>U</b>