

## Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

### ***Pilot Action definition***

#### **Purpose and scope**

Was the mission of the pilot action clearly defined from the start?

Were the defined objectives in line with the overall mission?

Have the objectives been defined as SMART (specific, measurable, appropriate, realistic and timed) objectives?

*-All of these are included in the traffic system plan, in which this project is included. The definitions are in the traffic system plan and the project is going as planned, except the timetable, that has been affected by the unition of municipalities.*

#### **Target group**

Has the correct target group for the objectives of the pilot action been identified?

*-The project (plan) applies to traffic system administration. The car rate (cars / 1000 persons) is the the highest in whole Finland when looking at cities with more than 20 000 citizens and the use of public transport is clearly lower than average, this has led to that, that the development of public traffic has chosen as one of the main themes. In the pilot, there was a plan created to develop the main public transport line. Other similar project has also started in Kouvola – Valkeala line.*

#### **Activities**

Were the chosen activities of the pilot action suitable to reach the objectives? Did they meet the needs of the target group?

Were the activities clearly from the start defined as SMART activities?

*-These are clearly defined. All the basis are defined in Kouvola regions traffic system plan. There has been made an agreement of implementation between municipalities and government administration.*

### ***Pilot Action Implementation***

#### **Stakeholder**

##### **Identification**

Were all relevant stakeholders identified?

*-Yes. They were identified. The most important user group is the common users of the public transport. The main problem is the low use of public transport. The problem is not any specific group, it's the weak status of public transport in the regions traffic system. It's a common problem, it's because of the general politics, not invidual user groups*

## Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

Were those stakeholders affected by the PA the same as those that were foreseen?

-Yes.

Did the stakeholders affect the PA as foreseen?

-Yes, they were a part of the process, but their affect wasn't significant.

### Consultation

What is your view of the stakeholder consultation?

- o How did the communication with the stakeholders work? **-poorly, queries were very poorly answered.**
- o How did the stakeholders show commitment for PA? **-sufficiently, bus companies and union were committed, and also decision makers in municipalities**
- o How did the stakeholder consultation improve the PA implementation and outcome? **-no affect, because the problems were already know, and the main decision in strategy level was already made in traffic system plan**

Ask the stakeholders about their perspective of PA

- o Do you feel well informed about the PA?
- o Are you satisfied with your involvement in the PA implementation?
- o Are you satisfied with the implementation and outcome of the PA?
- o Are you interested in a continuation of cooperation with the municipality?
- **These remain yet answered, but a query was sent to stakeholders. We haven't got any answers thought.**

### Implementation steps

Did we do what we planned to do? Have all activities been implemented as described in the PAPR? **-Everything was done and gone according to the plan**

Describe the deviations of 'activities', 'time plan' and 'others' as described in the PAPR and how they have affected the outcome!

- **The unition of municipalities affected the timetables and main questions.**

### Budget

Did the budget worked as planned?

**-Total budget was around 195 000, we used circa 90% of that budget, which makes around 170 000.**

Describe the deviations and how they have affected the outcome!

**-no problems**

### Risks

Did the foreseen risks occur? How did that affect the outcome?

**-Changes in the Kouvola region administration affected negatively in the commitment**

## Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

Were there any other unforeseen risks? How were they managed and how did they affect the outcome?

-The programme funding was delayed

-The ongoing clearing of uniting the municipalities has delayed organising and implementation. The decision of the union will be made 12.11.2007. We haven't had any chances to affect this.

## Assessment & Results

### Indicator selection

List the selected indicators and discuss:

- o Were the selected indicators relevant for the activities and objectives of the PA?

*Indicator 1: Influence to land use*

the affects can't be seen immediately, but however, the status of public transport is much higher in the strategy of the new Kouvola

*Binding municipalities to the implementation process.*

The implementation of the project has started in Kuusankoski. Other municipalities will make the decisions after the union of municipalities

*Binding government (funding decisions) .*

Strutural funding has become harder to get since the new era, because funding can't be forwarded in investments. The funding responsibility is mainly in the municipalities shoulders.

*improving the level of environment*

-there is no imminent answer to this

- o Are there any indicators which could have been more relevant?
  - The aim was to affect the status of public transport in the planning of city structure, it has succeeded.

## Monitoring and evaluation

### Monitoring process

Did the monitoring work as planned? Describe the deviations and how they have affected the process.

-Hasn't started yet, so these questions remain unanswered

Did you allocate skilled staff with sufficient time and resources to the monitoring and evaluation process?

Did you change the monitoring method (measurement, data source, etc.)?

### Indicators data collection

Present the baseline-scenario of the 'indicators of progress' .

## Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

Present the development of both ‘indicators of progress’ and ‘indicators of activities’ during the pilot action period! Add table (see below) and questionnaire/survey outcomes if suitable. Describe the results and their development.

Indicator	Unit	Start-Value	End-Value	Trend	Comment
influence to land use					In the administration of new Kouvola is planned to create a separate public- and passenger traffic development unit
Binding municipalities to the implementation process					as described above
Binding government (funding decisions)					Problems with the structural funding
improving the level of environment					Monitoring of emissions has started

### **Conclusions and ‘Lessons learnt’**

#### **Monitored results**

Did the pilot action achieve its objectives? What are the reasons for the monitored results?

What external factors influenced the results besides the pilot action activities (e.g. other campaigns not linked to the PA, political changes, etc.)?

**Pilot action was a plan, and it has affected to the becoming city's strategy and organization. The proposal is made, the final decisions are made by the new city's administration in the fall 2008.**

#### **Improvement potentials**

What could we have done better? What needs to be done to avoid the identified deviations from the plan in future pilots and full scale programmes?

- o Stakeholder involvement
  - To increase participation, it should have financial gain to the stakeholders
- o Implementation of action
- o Budget
- o Risk assessment
- o Indicator selection
- o Monitoring and evaluation



## Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

The main question is how much resources are allocated to public transport, and we expect a substantial increase within the new city

### Lessons learnt

Describe the success or failure factors, barriers and problems for this pilot action!

The development of public traffic has gotten quite much attention in the media, and it has risen as one of the notable factors in the political discussions. The results are achieved by telling the decision makers of the high car rate and the problems that relate to that, and also telling about the weak status of public traffic here in Kouvola region when compared to others. The matter has risen in to public discussion and the information that relates to it, is going to be one of the main themes as the municipality election comes around in the fall 2008. Developing of the ticket system has continued, so as the regional ticket would cover the whole province also connecting the railway – and bus ticket systems. Development project has already started with the support of traffic ministry.

Discuss the transferability potentials of the pilot action! What are the recommendations we can pass on to others?

Pilot action bases on a wider traffic system development programme, which implementation is agreed with an principal agreement between the municipalities and government.