Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	3027
GEF Agency project ID	3674
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-4
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	Support to Sustainable Transport Management in Dushanbe
Country/Countries	Tajikistan
Region	Europe and Central Asia
Focal area	Sustainable Transport
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	CC-SP5-Transport
Executing agencies involved	Committee of Environmental Protection of Dushanbe City
NGOs/CBOs involvement	NA
Private sector involvement	NA
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	March 2009
Effectiveness date / project start	May 2009
Expected date of project completion (at start)	June 2013
Actual date of project completion	December 2015

Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)***
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.03	0.03
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		0.97	0.82
Co-financing	IA own	0.20	0.29
	Government	4.46	3.10
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	8.11 (EBRD)
	Private sector	1.2	0.01
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		1.00	0.73
Total Co-financing		5.86	11.50
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.86	12.23

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	December 2015
Author of TE	Colin Shields
TER completion date	January 31, 2016
TER prepared by	Caroline Laroche
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Since the early 2000s, Dushanbe – Tajikistan's capital city – has experienced a rapid expansion in the number of private vehicles, and deterioration in its public transportation infrastructure. This "has led to the significant increase in urban air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. It is estimated that 87 percent of the total air emissions in Dushanbe are associated with mobile sources."(PD p.1) The project's environmental objective is "to reduce local and greenhouse gas emissions associated with the transport system in Dushanbe while improving access for all residents." (PD p.4)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective as stated in the Project Document is to "develop and help Dushanbe City Government implement an integrated policy framework that includes:

a) Enhancing vehicle efficiency and setting appropriate fuel quality standards
b) Improving the service quality of public transport, in particular trolleybuses
c) Increasing opportunities for non-motorized modes such as walking and biking
d) Developing integrated land-use/transport plans to reduce demand for travel
e) Enhancing municipal institutional transformation and governance structure to embrace sustainable transport."

(PD p.1)

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

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.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates the project as relevant. This TER also rates project relevance as satisfactory due to its good alignment with both GEF priorities and Tajikistan's national development priorities.

This sustainable transport project is in line with Tajikistan's national priorities as defined in various policies and actions plans, including the State Ecological Program for 1998-2008 (1997), the National Action Plan for Climate Change Mitigation (2003), the Programme of Ecological Management in Dushanbe City (2005), the Report and Action Plan on Building National Capacity to Implement Commitments of the Republic of Tajikistan on Global Environmental Conventions (2005); and the Strategy on the Environmental Protection and Rational Use of Natural Resources in Republic of Tajikistan until 2015. In addition, the project helps Tajikistan meet its atmospheric air protection objectives under various acts and laws. (CEO Endorsement Document pp.13-14)

The project is also well aligned with the GEF-4's priorities under the sustainable transport focal area, in particular with strategic objective 5 - Promoting Sustainable Innovative Systems for Urban Transport – as the project emphasizes the "development of "non-technology" options, such as planning, traffic management and modal shift to low-GHG intensive transport modes" (CEO Endorsement Document p.14).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory and describes the project's outputs as being "of high quality and impressive". This TER rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory since, as of September 2014, there were "no signs of C02 reduction thus far" (TE p.50), which was the most important metric of the project, and the project failed to create a meaningful change in mode of transportation patterns in Dushanbe. According to the TE, this was partly due to the delays incurred at the beginning of the project, as well as to overambitious targets, bureaucratic delays, lack of political commitment and lack of capacity of various stakeholders (TE p.45).

Despite those setbacks, the project was successful or moderately successful in attaining several of its outcomes, thereby warranting a rating of moderately satisfactory. In the paragraphs below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved its intended outcomes.

1. **Enhancing vehicle efficiency and setting appropriate fuel quality standards**

New quality standards for vehicles in Dushanbe were approved and published in January 2014. The project developed the new standards jointly with Tajikstandard (the Agency for Standardization, Metrology and Commodity Certification under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan). This component has been satisfactorily completed.

2. **Improving the service quality of public transport, in particular trolleybuses**

Pilot bus lanes were also built along 15 km of city roads (TE p.25). However, "in spite of the new bus lanes implemented, no modal change has been detected yet (in accordance with surveys in May-June 2015)" (TE p.51). According to the TE, this is due to a lack of enforcement of bus lanes, a lack of punctuality on the part of the public buses in Dushanbe, and slower than expected speed on bus lanes. Finally, car and parking policies have not been implemented, and are still under discussion. This component has been completed, but the desired outcomes have not materialized.

3. **Increasing opportunities for non-motorized modes such as walking and biking**

As part of this component, a pilot cycle lane has been completed. However, the TE reports that the cycle lane "shows poor design and modest use" (TE p.56). In addition, awareness campaigns in favor of walking and cycling were carried out. Unfortunately, despite those awareness-raising efforts having benefited from the explicit support of the Mayor's office, "no walking and cycling facilities have been included in new road projects" (TE p.56).

4. **Developing integrated land-use/transport plans to reduce demand for travel**

Several training and capacity building exercises were carried out as part of this component. Urban transport planning regulations are now included in the Dushanbe draft Transport Code. This component was satisfactorily completed.

5. **Enhancing municipal institutional transformation and governance structure to embrace sustainable transport.**

As a result of the project, changes to legislation on parking and driving in bus lanes have been successfully implemented. However, the draft Transport Code had not yet been approved by the National Government by the time the TE was finalized. In addition, various awareness campaigns such as the 'Safe Road Campaign' were held, and public authorities were trained to better understand sustainable transport issues. This component was satisfactorily delivered.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the cost effectiveness of the activities implemented as part of the project. For the same reasons, this TER also rates efficiency as satisfactory.

While the activities planned as part of the PD were probably too ambitious, "the pilot nature of the project gave a chance for seeking approaches and for shortcomings" (TE p.63). Following the MTE, project managers "found the way of the most effective use of financial resources, restricting them to the most effective pilot actions. As a result of this flexible adaptive approach, the scope of activities implemented corresponds well to the total budget" (TE p.63). The TE reports that cost-benefit analyses were conducted when selecting pilot projects to be implemented, and that the contribution of private sector organizations and NGOs to the project greatly improved its efficiency (TE p.63).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE rates sustainability as moderately unlikely due to substantial risks to financial sustainability and the important reforms still needed in the public sector to drive the reforms promoted as part of this project. This TER agrees with this rating and also rates sustainability as moderately unlikely.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Unlikely

At project end, there was still limited public sector funding available for sustainable transport projects, and there was no confirmed funding to continue project activities. NGOs reported having no funding for this, and "the private sector have said they will only continue to be involved if UNDP are coordinating the projects" (TE p.65). At project end, the UNDP was still trying to facilitate financial partnerships between the Municipality of Dushanbe and potential donors (TE p.65). Going forward, larger investments will be necessary to ensure reforms are implemented and further effort is made towards more sustainable transport in Dushanbe.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE reports that the Dushanbe Deputy Mayor "is committed to implementing sustainable transport policies and measures throughout Dushanbe" and saw this project as "just the beginning" (TE p.48). In 2014, the Mayor made a decree regarding sustainable transport in the city; there appears to be relatively strong political will to pursue project activities in Dushanbe. However, the TE cautions that the level of municipal support "can change quickly" (TE p.65).

Institutional Risks – Sustainability

The TE correctly reports that "substantial efforts will be required to build a successful coalition within the municipality and the transport sector in favor of the reforms" (TE p.33). Indeed, despite the Mayor's support, the municipal bureaucracy is causing delays, and the city does not currently have the capacity to drive the project.

As mentioned above, the draft Transport Code that has been developed as part of the project has not yet been approved. Approval will require changes to municipal laws and regulations, and the TE claims that "without UNDP involvement it is questionable whether this will actually take place. However, the legislative groundwork has been carried out as part of this project." (TE p.65)

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

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 project received more co-financing than expected, largely thanks to an $ 8.11 million grant that was contributed in 2014 by the EBRD for the trolley bus component of the project. The grant allowed for the expansion of the project and will assuredly contribute to enhancing the level of outcomes achieved by the project.

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 reports there was an 8-month gap between the project signature and the inception workshop, as well as a 6-month gap between the inception workshop and the inception report (TE p.23). Those delays were due to difficulties in obtaining approvals from the Municipality. According to the TE, this lost time at the beginning of the project "severely impacted on the ability of the project to deliver" (TE p.23). In order to mitigate the impact of those initial delays, the project was extended by 18 months.

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:

> There was very strong municipal ownership for this project, in particular emanating from the Dushanbe Mayor's office. The TE reports that "regular meetings and working discussions with governmental counterparts and stakeholders have created the sense of national ownership within the project related activities. Specifically, the project has involved the key stakeholders in the Dushanbe public transport sector and promoted the process of involved stakeholders' self-capacity strengthening" (TE p.36). In addition, the TE reports that "from the (…) meeting with the Deputy Mayor it is clear that he has a vision for changes to the public transport operations and in particular reducing the role of the minibuses and increasing the role of the state bus and trolley bus services in order to reduce the number of vehicles on the road and thus reduce GHG emissions. " (TE pp.63-64) Overall, it appears the project successfully created ownership among the relevant government stakeholders at all levels.

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 Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E design as moderately satisfactory due to the overall sound M&E system put in place, but acknowledging the weakness of one of the indicators and the very low budget set aside for M&E activities.

The project document presents a clear M&E plan (PD pp.10-12) and a sound strategic results framework (PD pp.13-18). The M&E plan proposed appears complete, including an inception workshop, an inception report, annual reports, project reviews, periodic project reports, technical reports, mid-term and final evaluations. However, the budget assigned to M&E activities is only $46,000 – less than 1% of the project's budget.

The strategic results framework is complete, presenting indicators for all outcomes and outputs of the project. Baseline levels are specified, as well as project targets, sources of verification, risks and assumptions. Most indicators appear to fulfill the SMART criteria, with the exception of the indicator for outcome 5, "Institutional change in government, business and general public with increasing efficiency of public transport and cleaner air, absence of congestion, leading Dushanbe to become a model for other cities in Central Asia", which is not easily measurable.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E implementation for the project as moderately satisfactory as some of the evaluation data was not collected. For the same reason, this TER also rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory.

Following the mid-term evaluation, the logical framework was completely revised to better match the project's reality. The mid-term evaluation also identified risks and proposed mitigation strategies, which were largely implemented. This demonstrates very good adaptive management from the project (TE pp.32-33). Overall, all project M&E activities appear to have been conducted as planned and in accordance with UNDP and GEF procedures.

However, some of the data that should have been collected during the project was not collected, making project evaluation more difficult. For instance, the UNDP team was not able to measure the change in GHG emissions as part of the project, nor to get a precise measure for bus journey times on pilot lanes (TE p.31).

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 Satisfactory**

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP's quality of implementation for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to some project design shortcomings.

While the UNDP appears to have provided good support and guidance to the project, there are a few areas where its contribution to the project could have been stronger. First, at the design stage, the UNDP should have been more realistic about the city's ability to achieve legislative and institutional change within the project timeframe. Indeed, project design was too ambitious and expected outcome levels should have been lower (TE p.30). Second, while the UNDP successfully built a relationship with relevant stakeholders during the project, "the process of setting up the stakeholder relationships in the early years of the project is not considered to have been efficient" (TE p.34). However, at project end, the UNDP had successfully built those relationships. Finally, while the UNDP was expected to host two Project Steering Committee meetings every year, only one meeting was held every year (TE p.34).

On the upside, the UNDP's involvement in encouraging legislative changes was absolutely essential to the project; the TE reports that "without the involvement of UNDP in leading and coordinating this Working Group then it would be questioned whether these legislative changes would have ever taken place (…) without UNDP involvement it would have taken at least 2 to 3 more years to get to the position of the Draft Transport Code" (TE p.8). Finally, the TE reports that the UNDP's "supervision over the Executing Agency was adequate, transparent and focused on results and responsive, professional and timel(y)" (TE p.46).

| 7.2 **Quality of Project Execution** | Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory** |

The executing agency for this project was the Committee of Environmental Protection of Dushanbe City. In the TE, the Committee of Environmental Protection of Dushanbe City's quality of execution for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to staffing issues that were detrimental to the project.

The project manager (PM) who was in post until the end of December 2012 was considered "not to be effective" (TE p.40). While the following two PMs were effective, the frequent change in PMs caused delays in project implementation and negatively impacted project performance (TE p.40). The mid-term evaluation also notes that the lack of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) "hampered the work on the project up to January 2013" (TE p.40).

The final evaluation notes that the project's management has noticeably improved following the mid-term evaluation: "since the MTE the project has been professionally managed, with a clear division of responsibilities, and good coordination in place. All staff and consultants have a good overview of the status of the project, in terms of activities and budget, and the remaining tasks to be implemented." (TE p.41)

Finally, the executing agency has shown a great deal of adaptability, for example when the project adapted its implementation with other major investment initiatives, including the Safe City project. (TE p.41)

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 TE reports that, at this stage, the project "has not demonstrated delivery of any of its stated outcomes/objectives (e.g. reduction in GHG emissions, achievement of the modal share changes or improvement in public transport speeds)" (TE p.45). As such, there is no evidence of direct environmental change as a result of the project.

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 socioeconomic change has been reported to take place 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

Various awareness campaigns such as the 'Safe Road Campaign' were held, and public authorities were trained to better understand sustainable transport issues.

b) Governance

As a result of the project, changes to legislation on parking and driving in bus lanes have been successfully implemented. However, the draft Transport Code has not yet been approved by the National Government by the time the TE was finalized.

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 were reported as part of the project.

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.

This project featured several pilot components, including pilot bus lanes and pilot cycle lanes. While they have not yet been replicated, the foundations for their replication have been established. According to the TE, "the project benefited from a very strong replication approach

which "has resulted in a clear exit strategy for this project with key stakeholders empowered to continue the success of the project" (TE P.36).

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 report presents the following lessons learned:

- Technical assistance - the Municipality still require technical expertise to avoid bad design issues such as the design and implementation of the pilot cycle lane and to avoid shortcomings in the design process e.g. the need to provide enforcement of the bus lanes. `SEP`

- Training and capacity building - since the MTE this has been a large feature of the project and has been one of the key success factors. However, from the TE it is obvious that the Municipality require much more training and capacity building both from the point of view of decision makers and technicians/engineers. It is the view of the TE that a significant amount of capacity building is required at the Universities particularly in the area of data collection. `SEP`

- Ownership and empowerment - this is critical in terms of the exit strategy of the project and relies on the implementing authorities having the technical and legal know how to continue the projects. `SEP`

- Legislative background - the project has required changes to National and local legislation in order for the pilot projects to be implementable. This seems to have been totally underestimated in the early years of the project. This is fundamental to any future changes in public transport operations and management and reforms (eg the role of the minibuses). This is also important since following approval of the Transport Code then the Municipality will need to amend their own rules which will take time and the Municipality will require support and training. `SEP`

- Funding and programming - the project at inception was over ambitious in terms of what could be delivered within the project budget and timescales. However, since the MTE the project has shown excellent adaptive management. Future funding to continue the excellent work of the UNDP project is a key issue that needs to be resolved. In particular the legislative work has demonstrated just how long it takes to make changes in taking into account for example the bureaucracy involved. `SEP`

- Political support – this is essential for the project's success and has, late in the project, been successfully achieved through the signing of the MoU and the very obvious Deputy Mayor support for the project. However, with the various changes in personnel at the Municipality the political will could be lost in the future and hence the need for the work of the UNDP to continue to nurture this relationship to ensure the momentum of the political will is never lost. `SEP`

- Network of stakeholder support is essential for the implementation and awareness raising of the measures - the project has successfully built a network of stakeholders consisting of NGO's and private companies. `SEP`

- The project has been implemented without the Municipality having an overall long term Transport Plan/Vision - this is a real shortcoming and leads to projects being implemented in a reactive, rather than a proactive way. Furthermore, there appears to be no interaction between land use planning and transport planning in the city. ⌷SEP⌷

- Monitoring and Evaluation - the projects' outcomes have proved very difficult to measure due to data not being available (as in the case of the GHG target) and due to inadequate capacity within the University (as in the case of the modal share and bus journey speeds targets). ⌷SEP⌷

- Changing mind sets – being an innovative project, education and PR of the measures used has been especially important to change the mindsets of the general public in terms of attitudes towards parking, cycling etc. Furthermore, to gain ownership of the projects by the Municipality has required changing the mindsets of the key stakeholders which has been achieved by collaborative working with stakeholders and capacity building training. ⌷SEP⌷

- Rotation of staff - both within the UNDP team resulting in loss of momentum and within the beneficiary/stakeholders which has delayed progress. ⌷SEP⌷

- Exit strategy - the December 2014 CTA report identified a clear exit strategy for the project which on the whole UNDP have delivered through 2015. Based on this a Phase 2 project proposal has been prepared with the UNDP seeking donor funding as well as considering other funding options (eg PPP – which in itself requires a mindset change due to possible stakeholder distrust of the private sector). It is the view of the evaluator that without funding and without UNDP ongoing coordination role that the momentum in terms of sustainable transport measures in Dushanbe will be lost and the project will not be sustained in the longer term. The scope for a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in this second phase to directly assist the Municipality is considered to be an excellent idea. ⌷SEP⌷

(TE pp.14-16)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

1. Incorporation of bus lanes and cycle lanes in all new road and rehabilitation projects, e.g. 6km section of road leading to Vahdat Municipality and Traffic Police to continue this work. Timeframe ongoing. Monitoring of lengths of new bus and cycle lane implemented and before and after journey time saving for buses and counts of number of cyclists.

2. System to prohibit private vehicles in bus lanes. Contract is signed and will be implemented early 2016. UNDP CO and Traffic Police to implement this system during 2016 and monitor its effectiveness in terms of bus journey times. ⌷SEP⌷

3. Transport Authority, municipality and Traffic police to expand the SDDC on an ongoing basis. Monitoring will be in the form of before and after passenger satisfaction and bus journey times.

4. PR activities to be continued by the NGO's on an ongoing basis and to be monitored in terms of increased use of sustainable transport modes and user satisfaction surveys. ⌷SEP⌷

5. MoT to continue with the work on the Transport Code legislation changes during 2016. Monitoring will be in the form of adoption of Transport Code by national Government and implementation within Dushanbe Municipality Local Laws.

6. EBRD and UNDP CO to continue with exchange of knowledge sharing on an ongoing basis.

7. Tajik technical University to implement sustainable transport teaching on an ongoing basis.

8. For future project scoping, UNDP should take into account more realistic timescales, ambitions, budgets and targets and ensure that the political will is in place. This should involve a technical review of proposed project deliverables, budgets and timescales carried out by UNDP on all future projects before project commencement. This is also required given the delays that were incurred in the early years of the project – one suggestion is that perhaps UNDP could develop realistic project road maps prior to the commencement of projects.

9. UNDP to ensure suitable appointments for key personnel at the outset of the project – this should involve an immediate review and update of all UNDP recruitment procedures including greater scrutiny of skills and competencies before making an appointment. UNDP should also ensure that a proper handover takes place when there are changes in PM/CTA.

10. More detailed planning of any future data collection needs to be made by the UNDP at the project scoping along with capacity building of the local consultant to collect this data.

11. Should any further transport work be carried out in Dushanbe then the first stage should be development of an overall transport vision and define supporting legislative/ financial/ management arrangements in order that transport improvements (both in terms of schemes and supporting legislative/management/PR/capacity building arrangements) can be defined. This is particularly important given that, as this project has shown, one measure on its own will not solve the complex transport issues in Dushanbe and the required transport measures interact with each other. The legislation work is a prime example of this. It is through a combination of measures (which will include physical measures such as bus lanes, supporting legislative measures, supporting capacity building and PR measures) that the transport problems in Dushanbe will be resolved.

12. UNDP to continue seeking funding for Phase 2 of project to include a PIU.

(TE pp.16-17)

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 contained an assessment of relevant project achievements, but was not able to provide an assessment of outcomes or impacts related to environmental change. This is however not due to the TE, but to the lack of available data.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, the evidence is complete and all necessary ratings are provided. However, some of the ratings are not sufficiently justified.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides a satisfactory assessment of project sustainability and exit strategy.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned appear comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented in the TE.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Actual total project costs were included, but not costs per activity. Actual co-financing figures were also reported.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report only provides basic information about the M&E activities that took place, and a short assessment of the M&E design at entry.	**MS**
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 in the preparation of this TER.