



Republic of South Africa
Department of Transport



MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE 2010 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND SPORT PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

28 FEBRUARY 2011

Prepared by:
SSI Engineers and Environmental Consultants (Pty) Ltd
P O Box 925, Port Elizabeth, 6000
Contact Person: Roy Bowman
Tel. No. +27 41 391 0400
Email: royb@ssi.co.za

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 Brief Description of Project	1
1.2 Context and purpose of the Evaluation.....	1
1.3 Main Conclusions and Rating of Progress.....	2
1.4 Recommended Actions.....	4
2. INTRODUCTION	6
2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation.....	6
2.2 Key Issues Addressed	6
2.3 Methodology of the Evaluation	8
2.4 Structure of the Evaluation	9
3. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT	10
3.1 Project Start and Duration	10
3.2 Problems the Project seeks to Address.....	10
3.3 Development objectives of the Project	10
3.4 Main Stakeholders	11
3.5 Results Expected.....	12
4. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	13
4.1 Project Formulation.....	13
4.1.1 Conceptualization and Design.....	13
4.1.2 Country Ownership.....	16
4.1.3 Stakeholder Involvement	16
4.1.4 Replication and Linkages	17
4.2 Project Implementation	17
4.2.1 Implementation Approach.....	17
4.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation	18
4.2.3 Stakeholder Participation.....	18
4.2.4 Financial Planning	19
4.2.5 Procurement Management	20
4.3 Results.....	21
4.3.1 Achievement of Objectives	21
4.3.2 Sustainability	23
4.3.3 Contribution to Upgrading Skills	24
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	25
5.1 Corrective Actions.....	25
5.2 Follow-up Actions	25
5.3 Future Directions	25
6. LESSONS LEARNED	26

LIST OF ANNEXURES

A	Terms of Reference	27
B	Itinerary and Persons Interviewed	36
C	Summary of Interviews and Field Visits.....	37
D	Documents Reviewed.....	43
E	Photos from Field Visits	44
F	Questionnaires completed with Municipalities	47
F1.	City of Johannesburg	
F2.	Mbombela Municipality	
F3.	City of Cape Town	
F4.	Polokwane Municipality	
F5.	Rustenburg Municipality	
F6.	Mangaung Municipality	
F7.	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality	

LIST OF ACRONYMS

APR	Annual Project Report
AWP	Annual Work Programme
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
CCF	Country Co-operation Framework
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CoCT	City of Cape Town
CoJ	City of Johannesburg
DBSA	Development Bank of Southern Africa
DEAT	National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Republic of South Africa
DLPG	National Department of Local and Provincial Government, Republic of South Africa
DME	National Department of Minerals and Energy, Republic of South Africa
DOT	National Department of Transport, Republic of South Africa
DSR	National Department of Sport and Recreation, Republic of South Africa
DST	National Department of Science and Technology, Republic of South Africa
FIFA	Federation Internationale de Football Association
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Green House Gas
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
IDP	Integrated Development Plan
ITP	Integrated Transport Plan
LEP	Large Employer Programme
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MaLM	Mangaung Local Municipality
MbLM	Mbombela Local Municipality
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NLTTA	National Land Transport Transition Act
NLTSF	National Land Transport Strategic Framework
NMBM	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality
NMT	Non-motorised Transport
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
PDF	Project Development Facility
PIR	Project Inception Report
PM	Particulate Matter
PMU	Project Management Unit
PLM	Polokwane Local Municipality
PPM	UNDP Policies and Procedures Manual
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PTIF	Public Transport Infrastructure and Systems Fund
RCU	Regional Co-ordination Unit
RLM	Rustenburg Local Municipality
SO _x	Sulphur Oxides
SPV	Special Purpose Vehicle (legal entity created for a specific purpose)
T	Tonne
tCO ₂ -eq	Tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent
TDM	Travel Demand Management
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP/CO	United Nations Development Programme Country Office
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
US\$/USD	United States Dollars
VKMT	Vehicle-kilometres of travel
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
ZAR	South African Rand

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Brief Description of Project

The South African Department of Transport (DOT) has received funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to assist it and venue cities for the 2010 FIFA World Cup to address the respective policy, institutional, financial, information and technological barriers to improving transport and to provide an effective, sustainable and environment-friendly urban public transport system. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was appointed by the GEF as the implementing agency for the project.

The DOT proposed to use the GEF funds, not only to serve the transport requirements of the World Cup events, but also to leave a lasting legacy of enhanced sustainable transport behind after the events, thus contributing to a long-term mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from the transport sector. The central focus of the project is to support the provision of improved public transport services and non-motorised transport infrastructure in selected 2010 host cities. Furthermore, the project aims to work with other selected municipalities across the country to influence transportation policies, build institutional and individual capacities and raise awareness about sustainable transport.

In line with this strategy, the goal to which the project contributes is “to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG) from urban transportation in South African cities through the promotion of a long-term modal shift to more efficient and less polluting forms of transport”. The project objective is “the promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, co-ordinated and integrated urban passenger transport system in South Africa, managed in an accountable way to ensure that people experience improving levels of mobility and accessibility”.

1.2 Context and Purpose of the Evaluation

All projects which are funded by GEF and monitored by UNDP are evaluated in accordance with established GEF and UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E, including periodic monitoring of indicators as well as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term and final evaluations and audit reports. In particular, the mid-term and final evaluations provide an independent in-depth evaluation of implementation progress. This type of evaluation is also responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access to information during implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is therefore to assess progress being made towards achievement of the objectives of the 2010 Sustainable Transport and Sport Project, to identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, validate the initial project assumptions, identify potential design problems, examine critical changes, assess the likelihood of the project delivering its intended outputs and provide recommendations on modifications or other actions that could improve the project and increase the likelihood of success.

This mid-term evaluation covers the period from project commencement in July 2008 up to December 2010. The project termination date set by GEF is March 2012.

1.3 Main Conclusions and Rating of Progress

The main conclusions of this mid-term evaluation of progress to date are summarised as follows with regard to the outcomes identified in the Project Document for achieving the project objectives:

1.3.1 Outcome 1 : Transport System Improvements

The improvement of public transport by the introduction of dedicated bus lanes and restructured operating entities has been highly satisfactory in Johannesburg, but moderately unsatisfactory in Nelson Mandela Bay (NMB), where the new buses were operated satisfactorily during the FIFA World Cup events, but are now standing idle while negotiations are continuing with the taxi operators to resolve the issue of compensation payments for replacing taxis with the new buses to operate in the dedicated lanes. This issue and limited municipal staff capacity is delaying progress with other GEF budgeted activities in NMB, where expenditure to date is only 23% of the allocated budget.

The improvement of non-motorised transport (NMT) facilities in the municipalities of Mangaung, Polokwane and Rustenburg is satisfactory and they were completed in time for the 2010 FIFA World Cup events in these cities. The other GEF funded transport planning and implementation activities in these 3 municipalities have also been satisfactorily completed. The only remaining activity to be undertaken in each city are the baseline and post-project evaluations to assess the impact of the NMT facilities on greenhouse gas emissions. However, the interviewed officials in all 3 of these cities expressed a reluctance to undertake the process of procuring consultants to do these evaluations for the small budget that has been allocated, namely USD 40 000 for each city. They felt that the DOT or UNDP should appoint a consultant to do the baseline and post-project evaluations in these municipalities.

The implementation of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on the R40 highway in Mbombela Local Municipality has been satisfactory in one aspect, but unsatisfactory overall. The lanes were completed in time for the 2010 FIFA World Cup and have been successful in reducing traffic congestion on the R40 highway, but are not being used exclusively by HOVs, as was intended. There has been no marketing campaign for correct usage on the lanes and no safety planning and training of law enforcement officers, even though these activities are approved for GEF funding. Only 6% of the allocated budget for Mbombela's activities has been disbursed to date. The reason appears to be a lack of motivation to procure consultants to undertake the tasks for which GEF funding has been allocated.

The travel demand management (TDM) activities in Cape Town consist of the upgrading of park and ride facilities at selected commuter railway stations and a marketing programme to encourage large employer organisations to promote the use of sustainable transport options for their employees. The upgrading of six park and ride facilities was satisfactorily completed in May 2010 and these were used extensively during the 2010 FIFA World Cup. A baseline and post-implementation evaluation of the impact on greenhouse gas emissions must still be undertaken. The city is in the process of procuring consultants to undertake the large employer programme. Expenditure to date is 38% of the allocated GEF budget for the city's TDM activities.

1.3.2 Outcome 2 : Increased Capacity and Strengthened Institutions

In the Project Document, this outcome involved two main outputs which each consisted of two activities. The first output was to increase the technical capacity of public officials involved in sustainable transport by funding tertiary level training and research at post-graduate level, and secondly, to place young professionals as consultants or interns with organisations involved in the GEF funded activities referred to in Outcome 1. Although there was initial difficulty in attracting persons to do research in sustainable transport, there are now seven post-graduate research topics being funded. Furthermore, ten young professionals are now employed by the DOT on sustainable transport activities.

There has been reluctance from the UNDP to make payments for the young professionals at DOT as they say it is against UNDP policy to pay salaries to interns working on GEF funded projects. However, this activity was in the Project Document and the contractual agreement and budget which was signed by DOT and UNDP. It was also not raised as an issue when the Project Steering Committee (PSC) ratified the employment of the young professionals. The subsequent acrimonious exchanges between the DOT and UNDP has added to the tensions that have arisen between these organisations over a 5% service fee taken by UNDP/CO in 2008 for services which DOT says have not been delivered and which UNDP/CO has not yet accounted for, despite repeated requests to do so by DOT and the PSC.

The second output under Outcome 2 was to increase information and knowledge about sustainable transport amongst decision-makers and planners through quarterly workshops and a web-based knowledge resource.

During the inception stage of the project, when the PMU co-ordinator visited the venue cities, it became apparent to him that the municipal officials who should attend the workshops were so involved in preparing for the 2010 FIFA World Cup that it seemed unlikely that they would be allowed to attend the workshops by their managers, due to the limited staff resources in the municipalities and the pressure to meet the 2010 delivery deadlines. The PMU therefore presented a proposal to the PSC to take the training to the cities rather than bringing the officials from each city to a centralised quarterly workshop. This was not accepted by the PSC and it was decided by the PSC to rather use the budget allocated for the quarterly workshops for a training programme for public transport operators which was being prepared by the Capacity Development Directorate of the DOT.

It is my opinion as an independent evaluator, that due to the lack of transport planning and management capacity within most of the smaller cities, the proposal of quarterly workshops for training the relevant officials in these cities should be revisited, now that the pressure of the 2010 FIFA World Cup has gone.

It is regrettable that the proposed web-based knowledge resource has not yet been developed to assist planners and transport managers involved in seeking sustainable transport solutions to apply in their situations. After the decision was taken at the end of 2008 to do away with the quarterly workshops, the development of the web-based knowledge resource should have become a priority as a tool for strengthening capacity and imparting knowledge to assist the cities and their consultants in planning and implementing sustainable transport for 2010 and beyond.

1.3.3 Outcome 3 : Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation

This is described in the Project Document as the fine tuning of the logical framework and project impacts with indicators and verifiers to gather project-relevant information, including baseline and end-of-project studies, mid-term and final evaluation studies.

From the field visits to the seven cities and interviews with the relevant municipal officials it appears that none of them, apart from Johannesburg, understands how to do the baseline and end-of-project studies, which should have commenced already as most of their projects were completed before the 2010 FIFA World Cup events in June 2010.

Although the Logical Framework in the Project Document and Inception Report contains indicator descriptions and sources of verification for the baseline and post-project evaluations, it seems that these have not been communicated adequately to the seven cities. Most of the cities have suggested that the PMU do the baseline and post-project evaluations, or appoint a consultant to do so.

The Project Co-ordinator has conducted day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress with periodic visits to the seven cities. He has produced Inception and Quarterly Reports and regular progress reports to the PSC and the Project Director of the DOT 2010 Transport Task Team. These have been found to be thorough and professional.

1.3.4 Outcome 4 : Project Management

Although the project management responsibilities of the PMU have been carried out as stipulated in the Project Contract, there have been some tensions over the responsibilities of the DOT as the Executing Agency and the UNDP as the Implementing Agency. Two issues require resolution.

One issue involves payments by UNDP to service providers or municipalities, once their claims have been checked and approved for payment by the PMU and DOT. The UNDP Country Office for South Africa (UNDPCO) has queried some approvals and withheld payments, requesting additional documentation. It would seem that this is because the Operations section of the UNDPCO is unfamiliar with the details of this project. If DOT was responsible for the disbursements, such delays in payments would presumably not occur, once the PMU has checked and certified the claims.

The other issue involves a 5% service fee of USD 200 000 taken from the GEF budget (by agreement with DOT) to cover the provision of UNDP support services such as recruitment, procurement, financial and technical services. This deduction from the budget was taken by the UNDPCO at the start of the project, before any of the aforementioned support services were performed, which is considered by us to be irregular. Furthermore, it would appear that the only services provided by UNDPCO during the 2 years of the project implementation are financial services for the payment of approved disbursements on behalf of DOT, as referred to in the above issue. Despite repeated requests from DOT for an account of services rendered by UNDP for the USD 200 000 fee which was taken from the budget by UNDP, there has been no formal response from the UNDPCO Operations Department. It is our opinion that this service fee should be repaid and an account submitted for actual services provided by the UNDPCO.

1.4 Recommended Actions

The following actions are recommended to achieve the objectives of the project, based on the mid-term evaluation:

- 1.4.1 The Project Co-ordinator should devote special attention to assisting the municipalities of Mbombela and Nelson Mandela Bay who have respectively spent only 6% and 23% of their allocated budgets. There have been staff changes in these municipalities and the new officials do not fully understand the project. They should be advised to focus on the most critical activities which will maximise

achievement of the project objectives and request reallocation of their remaining budget activities to achieving these objectives. In both cities, consultants have submitted proposals for undertaking the critical activities, but current budgets for these activities are insufficient, unless there is reallocation of budgets from less important activities.

- 1.4.2 The municipalities of Mangaung, Polokwane and Rustenburg have completed their budgeted activities, except for the baseline and post-project evaluations, which they are reluctant to undertake or to procure consultants to undertake for them. The Project Co-ordinator should confirm this situation and consider procuring a consultant on their behalf to undertake the baseline and post project evaluations for all 3 municipalities with the combined allocated budgets of USD 40 000 per municipality.
- 1.4.3 The quarterly workshops which were planned to strengthen institutional capacity for sustainable transport, but were replaced by the training of public transport operators due to expected lack of municipal attendance because of 2010 FIFA World Cup pressures, should be re-introduced to address the lack of knowledge about sustainable transport in municipalities. If the UNDP service fee of USD 200 000 is repaid, as we recommend it should be (see 1.3.4 above) it can be utilised to finance the workshops.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall aim of this evaluation is to assess progress towards attainment of the project's objectives and outputs, identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, validate initial project assumptions and look at critical changes since project design, assess the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs, and provide recommendations on modifications to be introduced after the Mid-Term Evaluation to increase the likelihood of success.

2.2 Key Issues Address

The evaluation examines the progress made during the two years since project commencement, with specific focus on the objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities set out in the Project Document. These are summarised as follows:

The project objective is: "The promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, co-ordinated and integrated urban passenger transport system in South Africa, managed in an accountable way to ensure that people experience improving levels of mobility and accessibility". The project aims to produce measurable environmental benefits, including an estimated 423 000 tCO₂ reduction in direct green house gas (GHG) emissions over a ten-year lifespan, air quality improvement and reductions in ambient noise levels.

To make this vision reality, the intervention strategy of the project is designed around the following three components or outcomes:

1. Transport system improvements.
2. Institutional strengthening and capacity building.
3. Monitoring, learning, feedback and evaluation.

Under the first component, *transport system improvements*, the planning of a number of municipal projects is supported by GEF. These have been grouped into the following categories or outputs:

- a) *Improvement of public transport* (high-impact mode-shift projects):
Rea Vaya Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, Johannesburg
Khulani Corridor Public Transport System, Nelson Mandela Bay
- b) *Road management* (transport system efficiency improvements):
High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, Mbombela
- c) Non-motorized Transport:
Polokwane
Mangaung
Rustenburg
- d) Travel Demand Management:
Cape Town

The proposed GEF intervention consists of providing targeted technical assistance in the design and implementation of the above-mentioned transport system improvements through the following activities:

- Transport demand analysis and feasibility analysis
- Formulation of business and operational plans
- Development of PPP structures for the operation of the selected systems
- Communications with and training of public transport operators
- Marketing, media campaigns and awareness creation to achieve the acceptance and support from the public transport and road users
- Proper linkages with municipal urban transport and land-use plans
- Detailed traffic engineering and infrastructure planning
- Technical assistance and capacity development will be provided to the four smaller venue cities of Rustenburg, Mbombela, Polokwane and Mangaung to facilitate implementation of the transport systems improvements proposed in those cities and to assist in the preparation and implementation of the Integrated Transport Plans (ITPs)
- Travel demand management.

The second component, strengthened capacity and increased knowledge, addresses the institutional barriers and gaps in capacity and awareness with regard to sustainable transport planning. In addition to the institutional barriers, constraints are also experienced with respect to the general undersupply of transportation engineers and planners in the country. The main focus of the GEF-supported activities here is to increase the knowledge and technical capacity of transportation professionals through training on sustainable transportation engineering and planning and increase the work-related experience of junior transport professionals in the GEF-supported sustainable transport projects of the first component.

Insufficient attention is given to sustainable transportation, especially in the smaller municipalities and there is insufficient knowledge about sustainable transport options and international best practices. With GEF support, an awareness and basic capacity building programme was planned the form of workshops for transport practitioners in which recognised international experts would present information and training on topics related to sustainable transport, such as cycle lanes, pedestrianisation, travel demand management, BRT system planning and design, congestion relief, stakeholder relations and public awareness, environmental issues as well as on transport planning for mega-sporting events. Invited attendees for these workshops will be national and provincial transport and city planners, as well as planners and civil engineers from the venue cities and from other municipalities. This component of the project also aims at developing a web-based structure and learning tool in which international and national knowledge with regard to sustainable transportation can be stored and used by transport practitioners.

The third component, monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation concerns the monitoring, learning and dissemination activities of the project's results and impacts. This includes baseline and end-of-project studies, evaluations and documentation of experiences and lessons learned.

In addition to the above three components, the key issue of project management is addressed in the mid-term evaluation, with particular regard to the responsibilities of the Department of Transport as the executing agent, the Project Management Unit as the co-ordinating, monitoring and reporting agent and the UNDP as the implementing agent for the GEF grant to ensure accountability for resource use.

2.3 Methodology of the Evaluation

The methodology used for this mid-term evaluation consisted of the following sequence of tasks:

a) Documentation Review

The relevant documents pertaining to this project were obtained from the Project Co-ordinator (David Ingham) and reviewed by the evaluators to obtain detailed information on the project and to compile a questionnaire for use in interviews with the project stakeholders during the field visits to assess implementation progress in the seven venue cities.

b) Interviews

Meetings were arranged and interviews were conducted with the following persons who have project responsibilities:

DOT Project Director and PSC chairperson – Lusanda Madikizela
PMU Project Co-ordinator – David Ingham
UNDP Programme Manager for Environment and Energy – Mpho Nenweli
UNDP Deputy Regional Representative (Programmes) – Israel Dessalegne
UNDP Deputy Regional Representative (Operations) – Paul Brewah
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for Climate Change Mitigation – Lucas Black

A discussion was also held with Marcel Alers, the UNDP-GEF Programme Manager, based in New York, when he was visiting South Africa.

c) Field Visits

The seven municipalities participating in the project were visited, namely, Cape Town, Johannesburg, Mangaung, Mbombela, Nelson Mandela Bay, Polokwane and Rustenburg. Interviews were conducted with the relevant municipal officials responsible for the GEF funded activities, using the questionnaire compiled in (a) above as a basis for the interview. The completed questionnaires for each municipality are contained in Annexure F.

During the field visits, the transport infrastructure that had been implemented for the 2010 FIFA World Cup with GEF funding support was inspected to determine its quality and usage by the public. Discussions were also held with representatives of direct or intended beneficiaries of the project, where these could be identified and contacted. Perceptions of the effectiveness of the project were also obtained from newspaper articles and from the staff of the evaluating consultants (SSI) offices located in each of the municipalities.

d) Analysis and Reporting

The findings obtained from the interviews of field visits were analysed against the formulated outcomes, outputs and activities contained in the Project Document and Inception Report in order to assess progress and to determine whether any corrective actions are necessary to improve the likelihood of achieving the objectives. This draft mid-term evaluation report was then compiled in accordance with the structure contained in the Terms of Reference (refer to Annexure A).

2.4 Structure of the Evaluation

The evaluation consists of a brief description of the project and its context and the key issues and problems to be addressed, as well as the expected results identified in the Project Document and refined in the Inception Report.

The evaluation then details the findings and conclusions from interviews conducted with the project stakeholders, field visits and examination of relevant documentation with regard to the formulation of the project and the progress with its implementation from inception up to December 2010. The progress is analysed against the originally defined objectives, outputs and activities to determine the extent of achievement, sustainability and contribution to upgrading skills and institutional capacity.

Finally, the evaluation provides recommendations on corrective and follow-up actions which are considered necessary for the project to achieve its intended objectives and describes the lessons learned to date.

3. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT

3.1 Project Start and Duration

At the project preparation stage in 2006 it was proposed that the project should have a four-year duration from mid-2007 to mid-2011. However, as a result of delays in the approval process, the project only commenced with the appointment of the Project Co-ordinator on 1 July 2008 and an Inception Workshop and Inaugural Steering Committee meeting on 18 September 2008. The termination date for the project as specified in the letter of endorsement from the GEF CEO dated 2 January 2008 is March 2012, which means that its duration is effectively 42 months, although all project activities must be completed by December 2011 to enable the Final Evaluation to be completed by March 2012.

3.2 Problems the Project seeks to Address

The project aims to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions through the promotion of sustainable urban passenger transportation in the venue cities of the 2010 FIFA World Cup and seeks to address the policy, institutional, financial, information and operational barriers in order to provide an effective, sustainable and environment-friendly urban public transport system which is planned and regulated at local levels of government.

Even though the 2010 FIFA World Cup has come and gone, the relevance of the project in addressing South Africa's need for a sustainable public transport system and improved institutional capacity to manage it, has not diminished. In fact, the findings from this mid-term evaluation indicate that the relevance of the project is even more important in addressing these needs, because apart from Johannesburg, there has been no significant improvement in public transport operations in other cities after the World Cup events, while institutional capacity in the municipalities continues to be a major barrier to improvement of the urban transportation systems.

3.3 Development Objectives of the Project

South Africa has an undersupply of local transportation engineers and planners. The project aims to increase the knowledge and technical capacity of transportation practitioners through supporting training and research on sustainable transportation amongst post-graduate students at selected universities and increasing the work-related experience of junior transport professionals in the GEF-supported sustainable transport components of this project.

The project also aims to increase awareness about sustainable transport and technical capacity amongst local decision-makers and planners by organising workshops and visits in which international experts will present information and training on all aspects of sustainable transport. It is also intended to develop a web-based learning tool in which knowledge and best practice concerning sustainable transportation can be accessed and used by transport planners and engineers.

3.4 Main Stakeholders

The main stakeholders in the project, besides those with direct responsibilities such as UNDP staff and the general public who will be beneficiaries as users of the improved transport systems, are listed in the Project Document as follows:

Category	Institution/Organisation	Branch/Department
National Government	Department of Transport	Chief Directorate: 2010 World Cup Transport Projects Co-ordination Chief Directorate: Integrated Transport Planning Chief Directorate: Public Transport Strategy and Monitoring
	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism	Chief Directorate: Air Quality Management and Climate Change
	Department of Mineral and Energy Affairs	Directorate: Energy Efficiency and Environment
	Department of Local and Provincial Government	Chief Directorate: Systems and Capacity Building
	Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa	
	National Treasury	
	Office of the Presidency	Project Management Unit for 2010
Provincial Government	Eastern Cape	Department of Roads & Transport
	Free State	Department of Public Works, Roads & Transport
	Gauteng	Department of Public Transport, Roads & Works
	Kwa-Zulu Natal	Department of Transport
	Limpopo	Department of Roads & Transport
	Mpumalanga	Department of Roads & Transport
	North-West	Department of Transport, Roads & Community Safety
	Western Cape	Department of Transport & Public Works
Local Government	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	Transport Planning
	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	Transport Planning and Management; Rea Vaya Project Office
	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	Transport Development
	eThekweni Metropolitan Municipality	eThekweni Transport Authority
	Mangaung Local Municipality	
	Mbombela Local Municipality	
	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	Infrastructure and Engineering Business Unit
	Polokwane Local Municipality	
NGO's and other associated institutions	Local Organising Committee for the 2010 World Cup Green Goal 2010 Committee South African Football Association South African Cities Network	
Academic Institutions	University of Pretoria University of Cape Town	
Unions and associations	SATAWU, FEDUSA, SAMWU, COSATU and TGWU Mini-bus taxi associations	
Funding agencies	UNDP/GEF, AFDB, DBSA	

All the national government departments are represented on the Project Steering Committee which is chaired by the Department of Transport. All the above listed local government municipalities (apart from Tshwane and eThekweni) are recipients of GEF funding for approved components of the project. The provincial governments are not directly affected stakeholders, other than Mpumalanga Department of Roads & Transport which has jurisdiction over the R40 highway, on which the HOV lanes have been constructed by the Mbombela Municipality.

Two other important stakeholders which are not on the above list are the private bus companies which operate in Nelson Mandela Bay and Mbombela and are directly affected by the BRT lanes and HOV lanes constructed in these municipalities. They are the Algoa Bus Company in Nelson Mandela Bay and BusCor in Mbombela. Both of these bus companies were interviewed during the field visits to obtain their viewpoints on the transport projects in these municipalities.

3.5 Results Expected from the Project

The overall goal of the project is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from urban transportation in South African cities through the promotion of a long-term modal shift to more efficient and less polluting forms of transport. The specific results expected from the project are summarised in terms of the outcomes and their respective outputs as follows:

- **Outcome 1: Implementation of transport system improvements in seven cities**

- Output 1.1: Restructured public transport systems (high-impact mode-shift projects) in Johannesburg and Nelson Mandela Bay

- Output 1.2: Road management and transport system efficiency improvements (HOV lanes in Mbombela)

- Output 1.3: Non-motorised transport projects have been supported and are implemented in three venue cities (Mangaung, Polokwane, Rustenburg)

- Output 1.4: Travel Demand Management projects in Cape Town

- **Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity and increased knowledge to plan, manage and implement sustainable transportation options**

- Output 2.1: Increased number of post-graduate professionals with training and relevant work experience in the field of sustainable transport

- Output 2.2: Increased information and knowledge about sustainable transportation options amongst local and national decision-makers and transport and urban planners

- **Outcome 3: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation**

- Output 3.1: Monitoring and evaluation tools developed and used for baseline and post-project performance assessment.

4. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Project Formulation

This section assesses how the project was formulated, as contained in the Project Document and whether the different components and activities that were proposed to achieve the project objectives were appropriate in responding to the institutional and regulatory context. It also assesses whether the indicators defined in the logical framework for guiding implementation and for measuring project performance are appropriate.

4.1.1 Conceptualisation and Design

The root causes of traffic congestion from increasing private car and mini-bus taxi use on some corridors in South African cities is a combination of the previous governments apartheid policy which relocated low-income black residents to the outskirts of urban areas and the inadequacy of the conventional bus and rail passenger transport systems. The inability of the new government structures to successfully rectify this problem and improve urban public transportation is partly as a result of other (non-transport) funding priorities and partly a lack of awareness of the efficiencies and effectiveness of introducing sustainable transport solutions, as has been done, for example in cities in Brazil and Colombia which were experiencing similar problems.

The designed project interventions to address the root causes of these problems by assisting selected cities to improve their public transport with BRT systems and non-motorised transport facilities, as well as innovative sustainable transport solutions such as HOV lanes and travel demand management are considered to be appropriate and satisfactory.

The assessment of the indicators defined in the Logical Framework for guiding implementation and measuring achievement of the objectives, outcomes and outputs is shown in the table overleaf, using the UNDP/GEF six-point rating scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

Some indicators have been assessed as moderately satisfactory rather than highly satisfactory due to measurement not being specific enough with regard to a time period or defined area. In the case of verifying achievement of the Objective of a safe and reliable passenger transport system, the indicator of public perception is assessed as unsatisfactory; a better measure would be reported safety incidents and adherence to published operating schedules from records. The same assessment applies to using public perception as a measure of the success of implementation of Outcome 1; unless the public are actual users of the system, they will base their comments on hearsay or what they have read in the newspapers. For Output 1.2, financial sustainability based on public transport subsidy payments is not a good indicator of the success of the HOV lanes, because the intervention does not restructure the public transport operations. A better indicator would be the punctuality of bus services which use the R40 corridor.

Under Output 1.3 the indicator which measures social equity in terms of low-income households within 500 m of the system and fare per km is not considered appropriate for these NMT projects, because most of them are linking the central areas of the cities to the sports stadiums and do not directly involve improvements to the public transport systems. A better indicator of social equity would be the number of persons from low-income households who are users of the NMT facility.

Project Strategy	Indicator Description	Assessment					
		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
GOAL To reduce greenhouse gases (GHG) from urban transportation in South African cities through the promotion of a long-term modal shift to more efficient and less polluting forms of transport	Reduction in GHG emissions associated with modal shifts and higher transport system efficiency		X				
	Improvement of air quality (despite economic and traffic growth) as measured by levels of PM, SOx, NOx and CO in the corridors	X					
	Decrease in ambient noise levels in the corridors	X					
OBJECTIVE The promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, co-ordinated and integrated urban passenger system in South Africa, managed in an accountable way, to ensure that people experience improving levels of mobility and accessibility	Transport Systems improving modal shift, efficiency and mobility for the selected interventions			X			
	Public perception of public transport in the selected corridors					X	
	Number of person-trips / annum on sustainable transport options	X					
OUTCOME 1 Implementation of transport system improvements in seven 2010 venue cities	Status of infrastructure planning and operations for 2010 in the selected venue cities	X					
	Number of public transport users along selected interventions	X					
	Public perception of public transport and non-motorised transport improvements					X	
1.1 Restructured public transport system (high-impact modal shift projects): BRT systems in Johannesburg and Nelson Mandela Bay)	Compliance with the construction schedule (by 2010) of the length of BRT lanes in Johannesburg, and Nelson Mandela Bay	X					
	Financial sustainability: Public Transport subsidy payments to operators for services in the corridor	X					
	Social equity: Number of low-income households within 500 m of the improved system and fare per km of the transport system	X					

Project Strategy	Indicator Description	Assessment					
		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
1.2 Road management and transport system efficiency improvements (HOV lanes in Mbombela)	Compliance with the construction schedule (by 2010) of 9 km of HOV lanes in Mbombela	X					
	Financial sustainability: Public Transport subsidy payments to operators for services rendered in the corridor					X	
	Traffic conditions in the morning peak hour along HOV lanes in Mbombela	X					
1.3 Non-motorised transport (NMT) in Polokwane, Mangaung and Rustenburg	Compliance with the construction schedule of cycle paths and walkways (by 2010) of 55,5 km in Polokwane, 3,8 km in Mangaung and 10 km in Rustenburg	X					
	Social equity: Number of low-income households within 500 m of the improved transport system and fare per km of the transport system					X	
	Integrated transport and development plans		X				
1.4 Travel Demand Management (TDM) in Cape Town	Number of people using car-pooling and Park-'n-Ride facilities	X					
	Participation of employers in programme to encourage employees to use more efficient transport modes	X					
OUTCOME 2 Increased capacity and strengthened local institutions (to plan, manage and implement sustainable transportation options)	Level of individual and institutional capacity and knowledge on sustainable transportation		X				
2.1 Increased number of post-graduate professionals working in the area of transport planning	Number of professionals with a post-graduate education in transport planning and engineering through the project	X					
2.2 Increased information and knowledge about sustainable transportation options, including web-based knowledge resource and learning tool is operational	Number of workshops / experience sharing platforms	X					
	Web-based knowledge resource tool	X					

4.1.2 Country Ownership

The South African Department of Transport had already intended, prior to the GEF proposal being formulated in 2006, to use the 2010 FIFA World Cup as a catalyst for change to achieve fundamental and sustainable improvements to the public transport system throughout the country, with the initial focus being on the venue cities. For this purpose it had established a Public Transport Infrastructure and Systems Fund (PTIF) and had provided guidelines to the venue cities for applying for grants from this fund for use in improving their public transport systems as a component of their Integrated Transport Plans, which are a statutory requirement in terms of national legislation.

The GEF project application was thus formulated to support this initiative, focussing on interventions that would assist in achieving the environmental objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions through sustainable transport solutions. This included strengthening technical capacity, particularly at the local level of government, for the planning and management of sustainable transport systems.

4.1.3 Stakeholder Participation

During the PDF B stage of designing the project for the GEF funding application, the venue cities for the 2010 FIFA World Cup were contacted by the consultants appointed by UNDP and were informed of the background and objectives of the project and were requested to provide information on institutional barriers and planning capacity constraints.

Two workshops were held in August and October 2006 for transport planners and decision makers from national, provincial and local government at which international experts from Colombia and Germany presented experience of sustainable transport projects in their countries. At the second workshop, the Project Manager facilitated discussion on proposals regarding the project and possible interventions that could be funded by GEF. There was extensive discussion with the stakeholders at the workshop and thereafter, concerning the various components of the project.

During the assessment of the sustainable transport options of the selected venue cities for inclusion in the PDF B submission, the key transport planners of these cities were contacted to discuss the proposals which they had submitted to DOT for funding from the PTIF and to agree with them which components of these proposals would be included in the GEF project funding application. The participation of the stakeholders in the design stages of the project is assessed by us to be satisfactory.

In the Project Document, the mechanism proposed for involving stakeholders in the project is the Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of relevant national stakeholders, together with the UNDP, and then a Technical Advisory Committee, if deemed necessary by the PSC, to involve all other stakeholders. As the Technical Advisory Committee was not established, the only representative of municipalities on the PSC was the South African Cities Network. As this is not a statutory body and the municipalities have no obligations to it, we do not consider it as an adequate substitute for participation of the municipalities in the project. Because the Technical Advisory Committee was not established and the proposed quarterly workshops were not held, the participation of the municipalities as major stakeholders in the project has been unsatisfactory.

4.1.4 Replication and Linkages

It is important that lessons and experiences from this project are conveyed to benefit similar projects which are being initiated in other cities in South Africa with funding from the PTIF, notably BRT systems and NMT facilities in the municipalities of Tshwane (Pretoria), eThekweni (Durban) and Buffalo City (East London), as well as facilitating dialogue between the cities within the current project.

The method that was formulated in the original Project Document to achieve this, namely quarterly workshops with transport planners and decision makers from all levels of government, has unfortunately not occurred, due to the reluctance of government officials and politicians to attend such workshops in the run-up to the 2010 FIFA World Cup because of the pressures and limited manpower resources required to complete the necessary tasks in preparation for this prestigious event.

Now that the event has passed, it is essential that these quarterly workshops should be re-introduced as a means of discussing the lessons learned and conveying experiences of implementation from local cities and international experts.

4.2 Project Implementation

4.2.1 Implementation Approach

Due to the fact that there was a 20 months gap between when the GEF project proposal was formulated in consultation with the seven venue cities (October 2006) and the official commencement of the project with the appointment of the Project Co-ordinator in July 2008, the cities had already commenced implementing some of the activities with funding from the PTIF. The first task of the Project Co-ordinator was thus to consult with the venue cities to assess progress and expenditure on their activities and make adjustments to the budget allocations where activities had already been completed with PTIF funding.

Our review of the Inception Report and subsequent quarterly progress reports and revised work plans shows that this was satisfactorily done and indicated a high level of adaptive management to address the changed circumstances over the 2 years that had elapsed since the cities had submitted their proposals for GEF funding support. In situations where cities had completed activities by July 2008 and therefore requested reallocation of their budgets to support other sustainable transport components in their Transport Plans, the Project Co-ordinator used the logical framework to assess whether the new or amended activities would achieve the objectives in terms of the indicators in the logical framework.

Our main concern is that the activity of quarterly workshops to increase knowledge and strengthen technical capacity in the municipalities was not implemented due to reluctance of the cities to attend such workshops because of pressure to complete tasks in preparation for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Our visits to the municipalities showed that most of them, with the exception of Johannesburg and Cape Town are sadly lacking in knowledge of sustainable transport solutions and the technical capacity necessary for the planning and implementation of these solutions.

Another concern is the operational relationship between the DOT and the UNDP Country Office. While this appears to have started well, it seems to have deteriorated and is, in our opinion, detracting from the effective implementation of the project. The two particular causes of the poor relationship are: (i) the 5% service fee taken from the GEF budget by the UNDP CO at the inception of the project, for services that have not been delivered, according to the DOT Project Director and the failure of the UNDP CO to account for services delivered or repay the service fee, and (ii) that the UNDP CO delays or refuses to

make some payments to the municipalities and/or their service providers when the invoices have been checked and certified by the PMU Project Co-ordinator and the DOT Project Director.

4.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation

Our assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of the implementation of activities to check whether actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, is that this is moderately satisfactory. While both the PMU Project Co-ordinator and UNDP Programme Manager visited the venue cities regularly during the first year of implementation to appraise progress, it seems that since then there has been several changes in the UNDP Programme Manager position and visits to the venue cities have become less regular. In particular, insufficient attention has been devoted to addressing the poor performance of the Mbombela and Nelson Mandela Bay municipalities and assisting them with the implementation of their activities.

The Project Document provides for the appointment of a Project Officer to assist the Project Co-ordinator. This appointment has not been made, which we feel is unfortunate as this person could have focussed on regular visits to support the municipalities which have technical capacity problems. This is particularly important in view of the fact that no quarterly workshops have been held to strengthen institutional capacity for sustainable transport planning and management at local government level.

4.2.3 Stakeholder Participation

The mechanism for information dissemination and participation of stakeholders in the management of the project has been satisfactory for those stakeholders who have been members of the Project Steering Committee and who receive quarterly progress reports, updated work plans and minutes of the PSC meetings. Stakeholders who attend the PSC meetings, mostly representatives from national government institutions involved in transport, energy and environmental affairs, as well as the UNDP project staff, were able to discuss lessons learnt and provide input to the management of the project at the quarterly meetings and via email correspondence or direct contact with the Project Co-ordinator.

The information dissemination to the other stakeholders in the project, such as the provincial transport departments and local municipalities was in our opinion unsatisfactory because the Technical Advisory Committee was not established by the PSC, there were no quarterly workshops as originally planned and the proposed web-based knowledge resource as a tool for disseminating information and experience gained on the project has not yet been established.

The participation of the seven implementing municipalities in the management of the project has been via email correspondence, telephonic contact and quarterly visits by the project co-ordinator to these municipalities. We consider this to be moderately satisfactory, as those municipalities who have performed poorly in implementing their components of the project, such as Mbombela and Nelson Mandela Bay have been the least responsive in communicating with the Project Co-ordinator and we think that more time should have been spent by the PMU in supporting them.

The Project Co-ordinator has established a good collaborative relationship with the universities of Cape Town and Pretoria as stakeholders, to select and supervise post-graduate students in undertaking coursework and research in sustainable transport that is relevant to this project. The Project Co-ordinator has also established a partnership with the international SMART organisation, a group of academics undertaking research in the field of sustainable transportation, which has agreed to provide support for collaborative research on

the topics in sustainable transport being undertaken in Cape Town and Pretoria. While these stakeholder partnerships with academic institutions are highly satisfactory, the dissemination of the results to other stakeholders in South Africa will depend on the establishment, marketing and use of the afore-mentioned web-based resource.

4.2.4 Financial Planning

The project budget and the disbursements up to 31 December 2010 are shown in the table below by outcome, output and activity.

Outcome/Activity Description		Budget Allocated USD 10 973 000	Disbursed 61%	Pending 2%
Outcome 1	Transport system improvements	9 194 047	64%	0%
Activity 1.1.1	Rea Vaya BRT in Johannesburg	3 501 000	96%	1%
Activity 1.1.2	BRT in Nelson Mandela Bay	2 464 500	23%	0%
Activity 1.2.1	HOV Lane in Mbombela	993 400	6%	0%
Activity 1.3.1	NMT Network in Polokwane	588 400	89%	0%
Activity 1.3.2	NMT in Mangaung Local Municipality (MLM)	912 400	96%	0%
Activity 1.3.3	NMT in Rustenburg	440 400	84%	0%
Activity 1.4.1	TDM in Cape Town	293 947	38%	0%
Outcome 2	Increased capacity and strengthened institutions	1 088 100	36%	13%
Activity 2.1.1	Technical training at post-graduate level	163 400	69%	0%
Activity 2.1.2	Young professionals	248 500	12%	3%
Activity 2.2.1	Training of Public Transport Operators	255 200	100%	0%
Activity 2.2.2	Web-based knowledge resource	271 000	0%	0%
Activity 2.2.3	Short-term Communication Strategy	150 000	0%	92%
Outcome 3	Monitoring, learning and evaluation	125 000	8%	8%
Output 3.1	Annual audits	50 0000	17%	0%
Output 3.2	Mid-term evaluation	50 000	2%	19%
Output 3.3	To be defined	25 000	0%	0%
Outcome 4	Project Management	565 853	75%	0%
Output 4.1	UNDP service fee	200 000	101%	0%
Output 4.2	Project Management Unit	365 853	62%	0%

If the effective commencement date is taken as 01 July 2008 and the project termination date is 31 March 2012 then the percentage of project duration which has elapsed at 31 December 2010 is 67%. Payments disbursed and pending to date add up to 63% of the budget, which compares reasonably favourably with the percentage of elapsed time to date.

The disbursement rate was much lower than elapsed time during the first 2 years of the project because the venue cities had more than enough funding from the national treasury PTIF grant for 2010 public transport infrastructure and they were using this grant funding to undertake activities that were in fact covered by the GEF budget. Now that the 2010 event has passed and the PTIF funding has been reduced, the cities have been submitting the invoices of their consultants, which were paid from the PTIF for doing GEF activities, to the DOT for reimbursement.

We consider this retroactive funding for completed GEF project activities to be acceptable, as long as the work done and procurement procedures are checked and certified by the PMU and approved by the DOT as the executing agent. However, the UNDP CO (Operations) has queried and refused to pay some invoices that are more than a year old even though the PMU Project Co-ordinator and DOT Project Director have certified them for payment. This has been one of the causes of tension between the DOT and UNDP CO.

We have noted from the above budget table in the latest quarterly progress report that Activity 2.2.3 (short-term communication strategy : USD 150 000) and Output 4.1 (UNDP Service Fee : USD 200 000) were not part of the original budget in the Project Document. The short-term communication strategy was for publicity and marketing of the project at the 2010 FIFA World Cup events, as approved by GEF and UNDP, which we find acceptable, but the USD 200 000 UNDP service fee which was taken from the Project Management budget at the commencement of the project, before any services were delivered, we find to be irregular. As stated elsewhere in this evaluation report, the DOT and PSC have repeatedly requested the UNDP CO to provide a reconciliation of services actually delivered for this fee, but to no avail. We find this to be unacceptable and can see how this has been detrimental to the trust and working relationship between the DOT and UNDP.

The total co-financing commitment of USD 328 493 000 for the project from the DOT and municipalities which is in the Project Document, has been exceeded in disbursements from the PTIF and Municipal budgets to date. This was mainly as a result of escalation in the construction cost of infrastructure that was required for the 2010 FIFA World Cup.

4.2.5 Procurement Management

The Project Co-ordinator has been thorough and consistent in scrutinizing the terms of reference and procurement procedures used by the municipalities for appointment of service providers to undertake the activities under this project and he has issued letters of "no objection" once he has been satisfied with the TOR and procurement procedures. In situations where municipalities appointed service providers to commence with GEF related activities prior to the official project commencement in July 2008, and have subsequently requested reimbursement for completed GEF activities which were paid for from PTIF funds, the Project Co-ordinator has requested documentation from the municipalities to verify that the TOR and procurement of consultants were in conformity with the project requirements and standards, before certifying the past invoices for reimbursement from the GEF budget. We find this to be satisfactory.

With regard to procurement planning in relation to the original work programme and budget for seconding transport planners/traffic engineers to the four smaller municipalities to assist them with their activities, the Project Co-ordinator engaged with the UN volunteer programme and evaluated 28 potential candidates at the commencement of the project, recommending 5 of these for consideration and selection by the municipalities for secondment. We found his evaluation of these candidates as reported in the Project Inception Report to be comprehensive. The local municipalities preferred, however, to procure local consultants who were familiar with the situation in their areas.

With regard to the procurement of a service provider to develop the web-based resource to provide information and knowledge about sustainable transport options and lessons for local practitioners, it is our opinion that this should have become a priority once it was decided by the PSC at the end of 2008 that the planned workshops were not a viable option for strengthening the knowledge and technical capacity of the municipal planners and decision makers, due to their reluctance to attend workshops because of work demands in preparation for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Although the Project Co-ordinator completed the TOR for procuring a service provider for the web-based resource in September 2009 and submitted it to the PSC for review and subsequently to the DOT to advertise for the procurement, the advert was only placed in the newspapers a year later in October 2010. We find this delay to be highly unsatisfactory, as by this time most of the activities under Outcome 1 had been completed by the municipalities without the benefit of awareness, knowledge and lessons that could have been made available via the web-based resource.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Attainment of Outcomes

The extent of achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives of the project up to 31 December 2010 have been rated in the table below from High Satisfactory (HS) to High Unsatisfactory (HU) for each of the planned outputs under the four project outcomes.

In order to obtain an overall rating of attainment of outcomes from this table, the ratings of each output on a scale of 1 to 6 (where 1 = HS and 6 = HU) have been weighted according to the project budget allocated to each output, obtained from the table on page 19.

The total of weightings x ratings was then divided by the total budget, which yielded an average rating of 2,07. This implies that the overall assessment of the project is satisfactory with regard to attainment of outcomes. The individual output ratings are explained overleaf.

Assessment of Results at 31 December 2010		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
Outcome 1 : Transport system improvements							
1.1	BRT in Johannesburg	X					
1.2	BRT in Nelson Mandela Bay				X		
1.3	HOV lanes in Mbombela					X	
1.4	NMT in Polokwane		X				
1.5	NMT in Mangaung		X				
1.6	NMT in Rustenburg		X				
1.7	TDM in Cape Town			X			
Outcome 2 : Increased capacity and knowledge							
2.1	Increased training and experience			X			
2.2	Increased knowledge and dialogue						X
Outcome 3 : Monitoring, learning and evaluation							
3.1	Completed baseline and post-project studies					X	
Outcome 4: Project Management							
4.1	UNDP Service Fee					X	
4.2	Project Management Unit		X				
Overall Rating (weighted with budget)			X				

The Rea Vaya BRT system achievement in Johannesburg is rated as Highly Satisfactory because Phase 1A has been operating since August 2009, albeit with a SPV interim operating entity while a compensation agreement with the displaced mini-bus taxi operators in the corridor is being finalised to include them in the entity. The baseline environmental conditions have been established but the post-project conditions for Phase 1A are still being quantified by the municipality to determine whether the environmental objectives have been achieved.

The Nelson Mandela Bay BRT system achievement is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) because the median bus stations have not been procured and the new buses which were purchased and used for the FIFA World Cup event are now standing idle, while negotiations are continuing between the municipality and the recently established taxi co-operatives to reach an agreement on the level of compensation at which the operators are prepared to sign a contract to commence operations with the new buses. The NMB municipality has prepared a business plan for the operating entity and for a Transit Administration Agency, but has not yet established the TAA or procured an integrated fare collection system or prepared safety and marketing plans.

The achievement of the HOV lanes objective in Mbombela is rated as unsatisfactory because although the lanes were constructed and used by public transport vehicles during the FIFA World Cup events, there has been no marketing or enforcement of the correct use of the lanes since then, nor have the other project activities of law enforcement training, public transport planning, safety planning and a marketing plan been addressed.

The NMT outputs in Mangaung, Polokwane and Rustenburg are all rated as satisfactory, because the NMT facilities were completed before the 2010 FIFA World Cup event, as planned. However, there have been no baseline or post-project evaluation studies by these municipalities to determine the environmental benefits.

The TDM achievements in Cape Town are rated as moderately satisfactory because only one of the planned activities, the park and ride facilities, has been satisfactorily completed. The other activity, the large employer programme only started with procurement of a consultant in December 2010.

The achievement of the first developmental objective of the project (Outcome 2) with regard to increased training and relevant work experience in the field of sustainable transport is rated as moderately satisfactory because although study grants for post graduate research in this field were awarded to six students at the University of Pretoria and one student at the University of Cape Town (compared to the original intention of assisting at least 10 students), the placement of young professionals at the DOT to obtain practical work experience related to this project only occurred in August 2010, which is two years after the project commenced. As most of the activities under Outcome 1 of the project were completed by June 2010, the work experience for these young professionals in the field of sustainable transport will not be as beneficial as it would have been if they were recruited earlier in the programme.

The achievement of the second development objective of increased knowledge and dialogue is rated as highly unsatisfactory to date, because the quarterly workshops were not held and the web-based resource has not yet been developed. Although the budget for the workshops has been used for a training programme for public transport operators, we do not think that this is an adequate substitute for the objective of strengthening capacity amongst local and national decision-makers and planners in the field of sustainable transport.

The attainment of Outcome 3 : Monitoring, learning and evaluation is rated as unsatisfactory because only one of the seven municipalities (Johannesburg) has commenced with the mandatory baseline and post-project study to quantify the environmental impacts of their activities.

The attainment of Outcome 4: Project Management is rated as unsatisfactory with regard to the UNDP Service Fee of USD 200 000 which was taken from the GEF budget by UNDPCO at the commencement of the project, before any services were rendered. It is our assessment, based on interviews with the Project Co-ordinator, that the services provided by UNDPCO Operations department have been only worth about USD 20 000, but UNDPCO Operations has not provided any account for the services rendered, so that the balance of the fee can be repaid.

4.3.2 Sustainability

The sustainability of the project has been assessed with regard to financial provision, institutional capacity and risk management. The South African government has allocated more than the equivalent of USD 600 million in the Division of Revenue Act (April 2010) over the next 3 years for continuation of public transport infrastructure development and for bus operating subsidies in the 10 venue cities that hosted the FIFA World Cup events, as well as in 2 other cities (Buffalo City/East London and Umsinduzi/Pietermaritzburg). This demonstrates the national government's commitment to achieving the legacy objective of ensuring improved urban public transport throughout the country.

The sustainability of the BRT systems which are being, or are planned to be developed in the above-mentioned twelve cities will depend to a large extent on the success of negotiations with the mini-bus taxi operators to participate in the new bus operating entities and surrender their mini-bus vehicles to be replaced with efficient and environmentally friendly buses and to provide feeder services in the new integrated systems. The mini-bus taxi operators are demanding compensation for surrendering their vehicles, in the form of guarantees of their current profits over the duration of the operating contracts of the new entities. Although Johannesburg and Nelson Mandela Bay have made some progress in these negotiations, additional effort needs to be devoted in the remainder of this project to providing support and capacity to the municipalities and the operators to reach a negotiated solution that will be sustainable.

In the case of Mbombela Municipality, the full benefits of introducing the HOV lanes will only be realised if they are used for their intended purpose, which is not happening at present. This requires the decision makers and traffic officials to be convinced of their safety and effectiveness first, and then for training in law enforcement together with a public awareness campaign for the correct usage of the lanes to achieve the project objectives.

It is difficult to provide an overall rating of the sustainability of the project, because while the financial sustainability is highly satisfactory in terms of the national government's commitment to continue funding sustainable transport solutions such as BRT, the institutional sustainability at local government level is unsatisfactory and will depend largely on how well the risk of non-co-operation by the mini-bus taxi operators in the implementation of the BRT systems is managed by the municipalities. If pressed to provide a single rating for sustainability, we would suggest it is moderately satisfactory.

4.3.3 Contribution to Upgrading Skills of the National Staff

The DOT established a Transport Projects Co-ordination Unit when planning for the 2010 FIFA World Cup commenced in 2005. The four members of this co-ordination unit, which is led by Project Director (Ms Lusanda Madikizela) who also chairs the PSC, have undoubtedly had their skills upgraded through involvement with this project. They have worked together with the Project Co-ordinator of the PMU and have attended meetings of the PSC where they have benefitted from the wisdom and experience of other PSC members who have expertise in the fields of environmental analysis, renewable energy, climate change mitigation and green transport technologies.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Corrective Actions

The following corrective actions are recommended:

1. The USD 200 000 service fee taken from the budget by the UNDP CO at the commencement of the project should be repaid and an account for services actually rendered to the project by UNDP CO should be submitted to the DOT for approval.
2. The quarterly workshops which were intended, but not held, to increase awareness and dialogue amongst national and local government decision makers involved in sustainable transport solutions, should be held as a matter of urgency to achieve their originally intended objective.

5.2 Follow-up Actions

The following follow-up actions are recommended:

1. Mbombela Municipality must be visited by the Project Co-ordinator and UNDP Programme Manager and the relevant officials urged to procure service providers to undertake the remaining budgeted activities that are critical to achieving the intended objectives of the HOV lanes, namely:
 - Marketing and awareness planning and campaign
 - Road safety planning and monitoring
 - Public transport planning
 - Law enforcement planning, training and monitoring
2. Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality must be visited by the Project Co-ordinator and UNDP Programme Manager and the relevant officials urged to procure service providers to undertake the remaining budgeted activities that are critical to achieving the intended objectives of their Integrated Public Transport System involving BRT, namely:
 - Updating the Operational and Business Plans
 - Establishing the Transport Administration Agency
 - Capacity development of the operators
 - Security and safety planning
 - Marketing and public awareness campaign
3. A service provider should be procured by the PMU to undertake the baseline and post-project studies for the municipalities of Mangaung, Mbombela and Rustenburg, as these municipalities have not commenced with these studies and have indicated that they would prefer the PMU to undertake these studies on their behalf, due to lack of technical capacity.

5.3 Future Directions

We recommend that the Project Co-ordinator gives particular attention to the content of the capacity building workshops, as recommended for reintroduction in 5.1 above, as well as the web-based resource which is in the process of procurement, as the next 3 years will be critical for the development of sustainable transport solutions in the 12 cities which have been allocated funds by the national government for upgrading their public transport

systems. These 12 cities should be invited to the workshops to promote dialogue and discussions of lessons learned.

The workshops and web-based resource must be marketed to all levels of government decision-makers and officials involved in transport and must be used as a tool to communicate international experience and local lessons learned with regard to sustainable transport solutions.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

The following lessons have been identified during this mid-term evaluation of the progress to date on this project:

1. It is bad practice for the implementing agent (UNDP CO) to take a service fee from the project budget before delivering any services and then not render an account for services delivered, when requested to do so by the executing agent (DOT). This has damaged the trust and working relationship between these agencies.
2. The removal of the intended quarterly workshops from the project, which were aimed at strengthening institutional capacity and knowledge amongst national and local government stakeholders, on the pretext that the intended beneficiaries would be too busy to attend them, has been self-defeating and the implementation of the project has suffered because of lack of capacity and insufficient knowledge about sustainable transport at local government level.
3. Where international experts have been involved in advising and supporting local municipalities in the design and implementation of their sustainable transport activities, as in Johannesburg, Polokwane and Rustenburg, progress in the achievement of objectives has been more successful than in municipalities who have relied solely on local consultants.
4. The mini-bus taxi industry is volatile and subject to frequent changes in leadership, which results in problems and delays in negotiating agreements. An important lesson has been the appointment of business and technical advisors to assist the taxi industry and build their capacity. It is also important to have an independent facilitator to manage the negotiation process between the municipality and the taxi operators, due to lack of trust between the parties. The lessons learned in Johannesburg and Nelson Mandela Bay in this regard must be conveyed to the other municipalities who are embarking on the process of upgrading their public transport systems and introducing BRT.

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

1. Background Information

The GEF-funded *2010 Sustainable Transport and Sport Project* was designed not only to serve the transport requirements of the World Cup events, but also to leave a lasting legacy of enhanced sustainable transport behind after the events, thus contributing to a long-term mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from the South African transport sector. The central focus of the project is therefore to support the provision of improved public transport services and non-motorized transport infrastructure in selected 2010 host cities in South Africa. The project is working with various 2010 host cities and selected municipalities across the country to influence transportation policies, build institutional and individual capacities, and raise awareness.

The project objective is: “The promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, co-ordinated and integrated urban passenger transport system in South Africa, managed in an accountable way to ensure that people experience improving levels of mobility and accessibility”. The project aims to produce measurable environmental benefits, including an estimated 423,000 tCO₂ reduction in direct green house gas (GHG) emissions over a ten-year lifespan, air quality improvement and reductions in ambient noise levels. Indirect CO₂ emission reductions achieved via replication of the project could be as high as 2 million tCO₂ over a ten-year period.

Practical demonstrations of urban transport improvements will be linked to substantial changes in the transport services in selected venue cities for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The project uses various innovative options including High Occupancy Vehicle lanes, non-motorized transport systems, Travel Demand Management (TDM) systems, dedicated bus lanes and rapid bus transit (BRT) systems to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Targeted investments include: construction of a 94 km Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) network in Johannesburg; 33.4km of BRT in Nelson Mandela Bay; 9 km of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes in Mbombela; and cycle paths and walkways in Polokwane (55.5 km), Mangaung (3.8 km) and Rustenburg (10 km).

2. Strategic Objectives of the Programme

The project aims to reduce greenhouse gases from urban transportation in South African cities through the promotion of a long-term modal shift to more efficient and less polluting forms of transport. The main objective is the promotion of a safe, reliable, efficient, coordinated and integrated urban passenger system in South Africa, managed in an accountable and accessible way. The following outputs are targeted by the project:

- Restructured public transport system (high-impact mode shift projects) have been supported and are implemented;
- Road management and transport system efficiency improvements have been supported and are implemented;
- Non-motorized transport projects have been supported and are implemented in three venue cities;

- Travel Demand Management projects have been supported in Cape Town and implemented;
- Technical capacity in sustainable transport has been strengthened;
- Increased information and knowledge about sustainable transportation options amongst local and national decision-makers and transport and urban planners; and
- Monitoring and Evaluation tools formulated and implemented.

3. UNDP/GEF M&E Requirements

Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the 2010 Transport Project management and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) Pretoria with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Service Center.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- i) To monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- ii) To provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) To promote accountability for resource use; and
- iv) To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. The project utilizes a mix of tools including periodic monitoring of indicators as well as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term and final evaluations and audit reports. In particular, the mid-term and final evaluations provide an independent in-depth evaluation of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is also responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.

The Logical Framework Matrix in Section B of the Project Document provides impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. These will form the basis on which the project's M&E system will be built. Detailed M&E policy can be found in the Project Document.

The Programme Management Unit is responsible for day-to-day monitoring activities. The Programme Manager is responsible for the preparation of reports for the Steering Committee and UNDP on a regular basis, including the following: (i) Inception Report; (ii) Annual Project Report; (iii) Quarterly Progress Reports; and (iv) Programme Terminal Report. The Annual Programme Report is undertaken annually, and entails a more detailed assessment of progress in implementation, using the set indicators. The report also evaluates the causes of successes and failures, and presents a clear action plan for addressing problem areas for immediate implementation.

The M&E plan in the Project Document also stipulates that the Mid-term Evaluation will be undertaken before the end of Phase I of the project. The evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. In addition to providing an independent in-depth evaluation of implementation progress, the evaluation which is the subject of the present TORs, responds to both UNDP-GEF's requirements for Mid-Term Evaluation, as well as GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

A Mid-Term Evaluation of the 2010 Transport Project will be undertaken jointly by the UNDP-GEF during dates October-November 2010 and will use the results of the independent Mid-Term Evaluation.

4. Objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE)

The MTE is initiated by the executing agency (Department of Transport) of the Sustainable Public Transport and Sport Project and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO). The MTE will need to be completed in time to inform the October-November 2010 Mid-term Evaluation of the project.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess progress towards the projects objectives and outputs, identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, validate initial project assumptions and look at critical changes since project design, assess the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs, and provide recommendations on modifications to be introduced after the Mid-Term Evaluation (including project restructuring and funding allocation, governance structure, co-ordination and management, etc.) to increase the likelihood of success.

The primary stakeholders in the MTE are the program's executing agencies, the members of the Steering Committee, the various project teams and task teams who are managing project components and activities, their steering committees and stakeholders, the UNDP and the GEF. The process and its outcome will also be of interest to other national and international partners.

5. Products Expected from the Evaluation

The MTE evaluator will be expected to produce:

- a) **An evaluation report**, of approximately 40-50 pages, as outlined in the section vii.
 - A detailed record of consultations with stakeholders will need to be kept and provided (as part of the information gathered by the evaluators), as an annex to the main report.
 - If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.
- b) **A Power Point Presentation** (circa 20-25 slides) covering the key points of the MTE to a joint meeting of the Project Steering Committee and the joint UNDP evaluation and supervision mission (precise date to be agreed).

A draft of both (a) and (b) above should be submitted within two weeks of the end of the in-country component of the evaluator's mission, and a final copy within a further week after receiving written comments on the drafts.

The drafts and final versions of the products should be submitted to the GEF Team, who will be responsible for circulating it to key stakeholders.

6. Methodology or Evaluation Approach

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the MTE will include, but may not be limited to the following:

- 1) Documentation review including, *inter alia*:
 - Project Document and Project Appraisal Document;
 - Project implementation reports (PIR's);
 - Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
 - Audits reports;
 - Annual Review Reports;
 - M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
 - Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

- The 2010 Transport M&E framework;
- Knowledge products from service providers;
- Project operational guidelines and systems;
- Minutes of the 2010 Transport Project and other project management meetings;
- Maps;
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
- GEF Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Projects.

- 2) Interviews with:

- UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
- Staff of the 2010 Transport Project Unit;
- Executing agencies: DoT and municipalities;
- Members of the 2010 Transport Project Steering Committee;
- UNDP Programme Manager for Environment and Energy;
- UNDP RTA for Climate Change Mitigation;
- Project stakeholders and project beneficiaries; and
- Relevant staff of DEA including the Chief Director, Zaheer Fakir.

- 3) Field Visits

The following municipalities should be visited:

City of Cape Town, Mbombela, Mangaung, Rustenburg, Nelson Mandela Bay, City of Johannesburg and Polokwane.

In addition, **but separate from project staff and their institutions**, the evaluators will need to specifically meet with selected communities (intended beneficiaries of the 2010 Transport Project) during the field visits.

7. Evaluation Team - Tasks, Qualities and Requirements

The MTE Team will be responsible for the delivery, content, technical quality and accuracy of the evaluation, as well as the identification of strategic recommendations.

Specific tasks

Focusing on the 2010 Transport Project, the MTE will specifically:

- Consider current, and projected, progress towards targets and present a rating of this using the six point rating scale;
- Examine effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of implementation and provide a rating of project implementation employing the six point rating scale;
- Examine project impact to date, including positive and negative, and intended and unintended impacts;
- Meet with key project stakeholders, including institutional representatives, communities, the private sector, NGOs, and academia; Comment on (tracking of) the co-financing for the project;
- Assess the potential development impacts of the project, focusing on (a) benefits delivered by the project, and (b) main beneficiaries of these benefits;
- Assess project sustainability (with a focus on key issues);
- Comment specifically on governance and stakeholder engagement processes;
- Identify deviations, reassess assumptions, consider changing conditions and risks;
- Highlight issues requiring decision or action at Mid-Term Evaluation, and make specific recommendations to ensure that project achieves its development objectives efficiently by closing date (2012);
- Present initial “lessons learned” about project design, implementation and management;
- Finalize the MTE Document; and,
- Present findings of MTE to a joint UNDP evaluation and supervision mission (date).

Qualification

The team should ideally have the following competencies and attributes:

Skills and experiences required

- Knowledge of the public transport system in South Africa;
- Understanding of policies related to public transport in South Africa;
- Familiarity with the linkages between the transportation sector and climate change;
- Proven expertise in evaluating multifaceted programmes/projects and results-oriented monitoring and evaluation;
- Previous experience in evaluating programmes/project for UNDP or other UN/multilateral agencies is essential; previous
- At least a Master’s degree in Environment, International Development, Economics, Engineering
- or other relevant field; and
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English.

8. Implementation Arrangements

- a) Management arrangements – The 2010 Transport Programme Coordination Unit with the support of the UNPD CO will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, and coordinate travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team.

The UNDP CO is fully responsible for the quality assurance of the MTE and the final product.

- b) The anticipated time frame for the evaluation:

Preparation:

- Desk review - 5 days
- Evaluation: Briefings with UNDP CO and UNDP GEF/Regional Service Centre – 1 day
- Interviews - 5 days
- Visits to the field – 10 days
- Analysis against UNDP Project Document – 5 days
- Presentation of draft to Project Steering Committee and the UNDP review and supervision mission – 1 day
- Integrate comments and produce final report – 6 day
- Presentation of final to the 2010 Transport Project Steering Committee – 1 day

Within two weeks of the in-country component

- Preparation of draft final evaluation report - 5 days

Within one week of comments on the draft

- Revision and finalization of evaluation report – 1 day

The above is subject to amendment based on the detailed proposal that will be presented to the Project Steering Committee.

9. Scope of the Evaluation-Specific Issues to be Addressed

The components of the evaluations include:

Table of contents

Acronyms

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project;
- Context and purpose of the evaluation; and
- Main conclusions, rating of progress towards objectives as well as rating of progress on implementation, recommendations and lessons learned.

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation;
- Key issues addressed;
- Methodology of the evaluation; and
- Structure of the evaluation.

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration;
- Problems that the project seek to address;
- Immediate and development objectives of the project;
- Main stakeholders; and
- Results expected.

4. Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** in conformity with the GEF guidelines for final evaluations using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Highly Unsatisfactory.

4.1 Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design(R). This should assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation (R). Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

- (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M&E activities if required.
- (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation. This should include consideration of the 2010 Transport Project Steering Committee proposed changes. These will be provided at the outset of the evaluation.
- (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

- (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
- (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

- (i) The production and dissemination of information and lessons generated by the project.
- (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
- (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
- (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

- (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
- (iv) Co-financing (in the project document)

Procurement Management: Including an assessment of:

- (i) Technical and human resource capacity for procurement management
- (ii) Linkage between work programming, procurement planning, budgeting, and disbursement planning
- (iii) Effectiveness of procurement management, as indicated by results of audits (internal and/or external), and reports of the evaluation and supervision missions by IAs.

Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R). Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.

Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff.

5. Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. Recommendations should be specific and clearly justified in relation to the achievement of the project objectives.
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Lessons learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

Evaluation TORs

Itinerary

List of persons interviewed

Summary of field visits, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders

List of documents reviewed

Questionnaire used and summary of results

Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions).

ANNEXURE B

ITINERARY AND PERSONS INTERVIEWED

No.	Date	Location	Persons Interviewed	Designation
1	8 Nov 2010	UNDP offices, Pretoria	David Ingham	Project Co-ordinator, PMU
2	9 Nov 2010	DOT offices, Pretoria	Lusanda Madikizela	Project Director: 2010 Transport and Chairperson: Project Steering Committee
3	9 Nov 2010	UNDP offices, Pretoria	Mpho Nenweli	UNDP Programme Manager: Environment & Energy
4	10 Nov 2010	JRA offices, Johannesburg	Lisa Seftel Brendan Petersen	Executive Director: Transportation Financial Manager: Rea Vaya
5	10 Nov 2010	UNDP offices, Pretoria	Paul Brewah	Deputy Regional Representative: Operations
6	11 Nov 2010	UNDP offices, Pretoria	Israel Dessalegne	Deputy Regional Representative: Programmes
7	11 Nov 2010	UNDP offices, Pretoria	Lucas Black	Regional Technical Advisor: Climate Change Mitigation
8	12 Nov 2010	Mbombela Municipality	Rodney Wandrag	Senior Technician: Roads
9	22 Nov 2010	Cape Town Municipality	Niki Covary	Senior Professional Officer: Sustainable Transport Planning
10	23 Nov 2010	Polokwane Municipality	Elmon Maake	Manager: Transport Planning
11	24 Nov 2010	Rustenburg Municipality	Nick Pretorius	Head: Technical Services
12	25 Nov 2010	Mangaung Municipality	Willie Loftus	Manager: Transport Planning
13	26 Nov 2010	Nelson Mandela Bay	Thabelo Ratshilumela	Assistant Director: Transportation

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS AND FIELD VISITS

1. David Ingham – Project Co-ordinator (8 November 2010)

David explained roles and responsibilities of the main stakeholders as follows:

- GEF provides funds for the project and appoints agent to monitor and administer funds
- UNDP is implementing agent appointed by GEF to monitor project and administer funding and provide support
- DOT is the executing agent responsible for managing the project. Established PMU.
- Municipalities are recipients of the funds and implement the specific activities.

David was initially appointed by UNDP as project co-ordinator, but this was changed during the project due to conflicting interests. He is now employed by DOT as Project Co-ordinator and reports to Lusanda Madikizela who is the DOT Project Director for 2010 Transport Projects.

UNDP has 3 different units which have an interest in the project:

- UNDP-GEF (based in New York) which co-ordinates and monitors all GEF funded projects
- UNDP Regional Office (South Africa and East Africa) – Lucas Black – Technical Advisor (Climate Change Mitigation)
- UNDP Country Office (South Africa) – Programmes and Operations.

There appears to be conflicting interests and responsibilities between the 3 units and even between the 2 branches in the country office (Programmes and Operations). David is concerned that Operations administers the payments, but has the least involvement in the project. This results in unnecessary delays in payments because Operations asks for information that is either in the Project Document or in the minutes of the Project Steering Committee meetings, which Operations does not attend.

A contentious issue is the \$200 000 fee that the UNDP CO took from the budget in 2008 for the services they were to perform in administering the project. David estimates that the work the UNDP Co has done on this project is only worth about \$20 000. DOT via the PSC has been requesting a reconciliation of the \$200 000 fee for more than 18 months from the UNDP CO, but has received no response to date. UNDP-GEF wants DOT to pay \$150 000 for marketing services provided during the World Cup, which he feels should be offset against the \$ 200 000 service fee already paid.

David says progress on all municipal projects is about 67%, but disbursements claimed is lagging at about 60%. The problem municipalities which are not claiming disbursements are Mbombela and Nelson Mandela Bay.

He is concerned that none of the municipalities have appointed consultants to do the baseline and post-project studies.

**2. Lusanda Madikizela – Project Director: DOT 2010 Transport Task Team
(9 November 2010)**

Lusanda said the delay in getting the project approved by GEF and the contract document signed by UNDP resulted in loss of momentum with the municipalities, whose focus was on providing 2010 infrastructure with PTIS funding. GEF funding was relatively small and therefore not a priority until after the 2010 event.

Consultants were paid for doing GEF activities by municipalities from PTIS funds, and invoices were now being sent to UNDP for reimbursement after being checked by PMU. If invoices were old (more than a year) UNDP required documentation of the procurement procedure before they would reimburse the municipality. This delayed payment. In retrospect, it would have been better if GEF paid DOT and DOT paid the municipalities and consultants. Lusanda said the high turnover in UNDP staff during the 2 years of the project has meant delays in the approvals and payments because new staff are not familiar with the contract document and subsequent agreements made by their predecessors. Also, UNDP do not attend every PSC meeting.

She is frustrated that the UNDP CO Operations Manager does not respond to emails concerning payment delays and the reconciliation of the \$200 000 payment advanced to UNDP as a service fee. She feels the services delivered by UNDP over the past 2 years are not worth \$200 000.

She is happy with project implementation progress in all municipalities except Mbombela and Nelson Mandela Bay. She thinks it is due to lack of capacity in these municipalities.

**3. Mpho Nenweli – UNDP Programme Manager: Environment & Energy
(9 November 2010)**

Mpho is the 4th person in this position since the start of the project. Has been in the position for a year but has only visited 2 of the 7 municipalities with the Project Co-ordinator, David Ingham. He is reluctant to visit the others on his own, because he does not know the contact persons. He feels David does not visit them enough to provide the support they need, particularly smaller municipalities, which are lacking capacity. He feels there is too much concentration on Rea Vaya. He is concerned that no workshops have been held for capacity building. He says the delays in payments are due to old invoices being submitted without the necessary back-up information. He feels DOT should have agreed to receive GEF funds and disburse them. He agrees that UNDP Operations have been lax about justifying the \$200 000 fee. He has spoken to them about it, but they have not responded to him. He is now reluctant to attend the PSC and receive criticism that should be directed to the UNDP Operations Manager.

**4. Lisa Seftel and Brendan Petersen – JRA, City of Johannesburg
(10 November 2010)**

Lisa said they have expended all their allocated GEF funds and completed the agreed activities. They are still paying consultants fees for advising the taxi industry and legal fees concerning procurement of the buses. They have requested more GEF funding to continue with these activities. They feel the project has been highly satisfactory, although the impacts on reducing traffic congestion will only be fully realised after Phase 1B has been completed and more articulated buses are operating. The provision of independent technical support and capacitation to the taxi industry to assist them in their negotiations with the City bore very important dividends. It enabled them to negotiate from an informed position and on a level playing field. The legal support to the City also enabled the development of innovative agreements which assisted in the negotiations with the taxi industry. Their only issue of

concern was delays in some payments from UNDP to consultants. Eventually JRA paid the consultants and were reimbursed by UNDP. A questionnaire was completed (see Annexure F1).

**5. Paul Brewah – UNDP Deputy Regional Representative: Operations
(10 November 2010)**

Paul said delays in payments were caused by insufficient back-up documentation submitted with invoices. He was also suspicious when invoices were more than a year old. The Project Document had clauses which were contrary to UNDP policy and in this opinion, it should not have been signed by UNDP-GEF, particularly the clause which allowed for the payment of interns employed by DOT. This was against UNDP and GEF protocols.

The agreement for UNDP to take a service fee of \$200 000 for procuring service providers was made before he came to this project and he does not know why UNDP is not providing these services. He agreed that the services UNDP has provided for the 2010 projects are a lot less than \$200 000, but it cannot be repaid because it has been used for the provision of other services. He said it would be pointless to try and reconcile UNDP CO's project services with this amount, because detailed records of UNDP CO's internal expenditure are not kept for each specific project. He agreed that the PSC is the mechanism to resolve issues between DOT and UNDP, but he feels that UNDP is not adequately represented on the PSC.

**6. Israel Dessalegne – UNDP Deputy Regional Representative: Programmes
(11 November 2010)**

Israel said that he was concerned that certain procedures were not being followed with regard to payments, as provided for in the Project Document and Agreement. It was unfortunate that tensions have developed between the DOT and the UNDP CO over interpretation of the payment conditions set out in the Agreement, particular with regard to the employment of interns by DOT and the service fee paid in advance to UNDP CO, without any explanation of how this service fee has been used after 18 months. Israel said these issues needed to be resolved as a matter of urgency.

**7. Lucas Black – Regional Technical Advisor: Climate Change Mitigation and
Marcel Alers – UNDP-GEF Programme Manager (11 November 2010)**

Lucas expressed similar concerns to Israel Dessalegne about the tensions between DOT and UNDP CO, which were diverting the focus away from the successful completion of the project. He was concerned about the slow rate of expenditure on the project and felt that the DOT and PMU could have provided more support to the municipalities by means of capacity building and web-based information to assist them with their projects.

He referred to criticism of the project from the South African GEF focal point (DEAT Chief Directorate: International Governance and Relations) with regard to publicity and said the UNDP Regional Office had prepared marketing material and media releases in response to a request for this (e.g. in SAA's Sawubona magazine) but had subsequently been criticized by DOT and had not yet been paid for doing this. It was unfortunate that the PMU's comments on the draft advert did not reach the publisher before it was published.

Marcel Alers said he felt that the advance payment of \$ 200 000 taken from the budget by the UNDP CO as a service fee before any services were delivered, was not according to UNDP protocol. He said the UNDP CO should account for what they have used this fee for and repay the balance.

8. Rodney Wandrag - Senior Civil Engineering Technician: Mbombela Municipality (12 November 2010)

Arrangements were made to meet with Rodney and his supervisor who is responsible for the project, Lawrence Mabaso, but Lawrence never arrived for the meeting and Rodney did not know where he was. It was subsequently learned that he had to urgently seek medical attention that morning.

Rodney said that the HOV lanes construction had been completed in time for the World Cup and has resulted in a dramatic reduction in traffic congestion on the R40 highway. The traffic officers were not enforcing usage of the HOV lanes and all types of vehicles were using them. There has been no marketing of the correct use of the lanes in the media. A media consultant was appointed during the construction process, but he only kept the public informed about the construction programme and when certain parts of the road would be closed.

Rodney felt it was necessary to do some traffic modelling to convince the traffic officials that the HOV would operate safely, if enforced, particularly with regard to weaving movements by buses and taxis at intersections. He received a quote from consultants to do this modelling, but it was more than the budget allocated for the safety plan, so he has not taken the matter further.

He said the municipality does not have the capacity to undertake the baseline and post-project studies and feels that the DOT should appoint consultants to do this, as the procurement process in the municipality takes too long. A questionnaire was completed (see Annexure F2).

9. Niki Covary - Senior Professional Officer: Sustainable Transport Planning: City of Cape Town (22 November 2010)

The interview was carried out with Niki, assisted by Melani Ohlson, a project manager and Gerhard Hitge, a consultant to the City of Town during the World Cup at the time the park and ride project was implemented, and now employed on contract by the City.

Of the three approved GEF projects, only the park and ride project has in fact been implemented. The interview thus focused on this project. The consensus was that this project had been highly successful and had contributed in some measure to the reduction in the use of private cars and hence vehicle emissions both during and post the World Cup. A site visit was undertaken to one of the park and ride facilities. It is clearly apparent that the facility is a valuable asset and is still being used optimally. A questionnaire was completed (see Annexure F3).

10. Elmon Maake – Manager: Transport Planning, Polokwane Municipality (23 November 2010)

The interview was conducted with Elmon and his appointed project manager Lauden Mlaudzi from A & M Consulting, who were appointed to project manage the implementation of all transport infrastructure and systems for the 2010 World Cup on behalf of Polokwane Municipality. Lauden explained that all of the NMT infrastructure and CCTV monitoring planned and designed with GEF funding was completed in time for the World Cup. The upgrading of the traffic signals that was planned and designed with GEF funding is in the process of implementation with co-funding from the PTIF and the municipal budget.

The GEF funds that were initially allocated for implementation assistance by a seconded transport planner/traffic engineer were used to pay for the preparation of the operational plan for the proposed Integrated Rapid Public Transport System which is to be implemented in the next 3 years with funding from the PTIF.

A questionnaire was completed (see Annexure F4) and a site visit was conducted to inspect all the NMT infrastructure and the control centre where the CCTV system and traffic signals are monitored.

**11. Nick Pretorius – Head: Technical Services, Rustenburg Municipality
(24 November 2010)**

Nick explained that all the NMT infrastructure was designed and construction had commenced before the GEF projects started in late 2008. With the agreement of the Project Co-ordinator it was agreed that the GEF budget of the project could be used to pay for the design and supervision of the NMT component of roads that were upgraded in the vicinity of the Bafokeng Stadium and to pay the fees of consultants who were preparing the Integrated Transport Plan and the operational and business plans for the proposed BRT system between Phokeng and Rustenburg. This has been done and the only remaining activity to be done is the baseline and post-project evaluation. Nick said he would like the DOT to procure consultants to do this for the municipality as he did not have the capacity to do it or to procure consultants to do it.

A questionnaire was completed (see Annexure F5) and a site visit was undertaken to inspect the NMT infrastructure and the proposed BRT route from Phokeng to the Rustenburg CBD.

12. Willie Loftus – Manager: Metropolitan Transport Planning, Mangaung Local Municipality (25 November 2010)

Initially there was some difficulty in contacting the project manager responsible for the UNDP projects at the Mangaung Local Municipality. Contact was however made with Willie Loftus who advised that the person - Ms Palesa Mohapi, was on extended sick leave and could not be reached. Willie Loftus : Manager Metropolitan Transport Planning then offered to assist and the interview took place on 25 November 2010.

Willie was initially uncertain of the exact extent of the projects that were undertaken in Bloemfontein on which GEF funds were spent. Initially it was thought that the Selbourne Avenue pedestrian corridor and bridge over Markgraaf Street was the primary project and the interview was conducted on that basis. Willie was also under the impression that although funds had been claimed from the GEF via the DOT, no funds had in fact been received. After following up the details with Dave Ingham, it was ascertained that only the pedestrian bridge over Markgraaf Street was approved for GEF funding and that the balance of the funds claimed were to cover planning and monitoring expenditure on the Mangaung Intermodal Transport Facility.

A further telephonic interview was conducted with Willie to obtain the details which are recorded on the interview questionnaire (see Annexure F6). Willie was, at that stage, also able to confirm that the funds claimed, had in fact been received by the Municipality. Furthermore it was ascertained from the project progress report and PSC minutes that the funds claimed retroactively by Mangaung could be utilized on the Maitland Street and Hoffman Square pedestrianisation projects. To date only the planning of these projects was carried out and no implementation has taken place at all.

A particular concern is that there has been no baseline post-project evaluation carried out of the project performance indicators.

Overall it seems that the pedestrian bridge project was very successful and is a valuable addition to the non-motorised network in the city. The project certainly contributed to the reduction of the use of private vehicles in the CBD during the World Cup and hence a reduction in vehicle emissions. Although it was observed that pedestrians are using the bridge it is doubtful that this will reduce the use of private cars in a sustainable way to any marked extent. The construction of the Intermodal Transfer Facility has not yet been completed and thus the benefits are not yet visible.

13. Thabelo Ratshilumela – Assistant Director: Transportation, Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality (26 November 2010)

Thabelo said he had only recently joined the NMBM and has taken over responsibility for this project after Keith Mitchell who was previously responsible for it had resigned. The interview was also attended by Keith Mitchell, Luvuyo Ntshembe from NMBM and Cavell Chiloane from BKS who was appointed by NMBM as project manager for the implementation of all infrastructure associated with the 2010 World Cup.

Keith Mitchell explained that the IPTS/BRT Operational Plan and Business Plan for establishing the operating entity had been completed with PTIF funding for which NMBM had received reimbursement from UNDP-GEF.

He said the municipality had requested BKS to prepare a TOR for procuring service providers to perform the functions of the Transport Administration Agency until the NMBM had completed a Section 78 investigation to decide whether it could handle these functions internally. BKS is still busy with this TOR. The procurement of a service provider for Marketing and Awareness had to be aborted at the award stage because of legal issues that arose during the adjudication of tenders received.

The BRT lanes have been completed for Phase 1 but the median bus stations and modal interchanges and an electronic ticketing system must still be procured. Negotiations are continuing with the Taxi Forum to reach an agreement on the compensation for operators who surrender their vehicles and permits, as well as on the terms and conditions of the operating contract that they will enter into with the municipality to operate the new buses which were purchased for the World Cup, but are now parked under NMBM security.

A questionnaire was completed (see Annexure F7).

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Project Design Report, PDF B, December 2006.
2. Project Document and Logical Framework (undated).
3. DOT Public Transport Strategy and Action Plan, March 2007.
4. Inception Report, October 2008.
5. Quarterly Progress Reports (2008 – 2010).
6. Status of Project Delivery, December 2009.
7. Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings.
8. Annual Project Review and Project Implementation Reports.
9. UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.
10. Manual for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits.
11. Memoranda of Agreements with Municipalities.
12. Summaries of Project Disbursements.

PHOTOS FROM FIELD VISITS

1. City of Johannesburg



Ellis Park Stadium BRT stop



Suburban area BRT stop

2. Mbombela Municipality



Buses avoiding HOV lanes because of other traffic in lanes



Buses cannot enter HOV lane due to use by single occupant vehicles

3. City of Cape Town



Monte Vista Park & Ride



Park & Ride resurfaced and trees planted

4. Polokwane Municipality



Upgraded sidewalk in CBD



Upgraded signalised intersection with protected sidewalks on bridge

5. Rustenburg Municipality



New sidewalk in residential area



New sidewalk and bus/taxi stop

6. Mangaung Municipality



Selborne pedestrian bridge



New walkway to stadium

7. Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality



New buses at CBD stop



NMT facilities in CBD

QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED WITH MUNICIPALITIES