

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

Why evaluation?

The purpose of pilot actions is to test new approaches to solving problems of sustainable urban transport. It is also to understand how pilot projects can become full scale programmes. Each city is monitoring the implementation of the Pilot actions. From this monitoring information we are carrying out an evaluation- these are the 'lessons learnt'. Evaluation helps us understand how and why the pilots worked or did not work. A successful pilot action produces an evaluation; a successful pilot does not need positive outcomes.

A pilot action which did not achieve its objectives is a success if the evaluation helped to explain the reasons why. The evaluation identifies mistakes and where future improvements can be made before a pilot is expanded to a full scale programme.

A pilot action that is successfully in achieving its objectives is not a successful pilot action if the reasons for success are unknown – we cannot repeat the success if we do not understand why it was a success!

Evaluation is more than monitoring and measuring indicators. It includes the process of planning and implementing the pilot action.

We need to know about all the pilot actions which have been implemented, whether they went to plan, did not ever get started, or had to be changed half way through. All the pilot actions need to be evaluated. All pilot actions provide valuable 'lessons learnt', even though they are delayed, not finalised, cancelled, etc. With this in mind and a thorough evaluation all pilot actions can be successful.

Example: Why evaluation?

The following example provides an extremely short summary of an evaluation of a not-finalised pilot action to show why evaluation is useful.

A pilot project in a city aimed at coordinating freight deliveries into the city centre by helping shopkeepers cooperate in deliveries. The shopkeepers were contacted and invited to take part in the project and to coordinate their deliveries. The objective was to reduce the total number of freight deliveries. In the beginning there was a big interest among shopkeepers to take part. During the pilot the shopkeepers lost interest and the project was terminated due to lack of participants.

In the evaluation process, conversations with the shopkeepers have discovered the reasons for losing interest. Some shopkeepers don't see any problems with freight transport in the city centre or don't see the benefit of cooperation. Some do not see any incentive to cooperate. Others do not appreciate that they may have the opportunity or possibility to alter their delivery arrangements.

The evaluation discovered the reasons for the lost interest of the participants. It also identified that for future pilots and main programmes it is important to support shopkeepers' and improve their awareness about the impact of their freight deliveries. More effort and more time spent informing the shopkeepers is probably needed. Furthermore, without incentives or obvious benefits it is hard to convince shopkeepers to take part.

These lessons learnt can be used by this city and others to improve their pilot action approach in order to be more successful. Without evaluation the mistakes could be repeated and could lead to the same failures. Furthermore some cities would not even try this approach since it has been 'proven' to be a generally wrong approach.



Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

How to evaluate?

This template provides the framework for evaluating the pilot actions. It follows the structure of the Pilot Action Planning Report (PAPR). In the evaluation the actual implementation process should be compared with the planned implementation process - as it is described in the PAPR. Deviations in the implementation from the plan and the underlying reasons should be identified and reported. A complete PAPR is a prerequisite for a successful evaluation.

The template provides guiding questions for each section of the PAPR which gives support for the evaluation. The questions should not be answered only with yes or no. It is not required to strictly follow the provided questions, but it is necessary to complete all sections in the template. All deviations, obstacles, delays, etc. and how they were treated are important to mention.

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

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?

The mission was defined very clearly and specifically. The mission could be divided into two parts: 1) “improve or at least keep the quality of public transport in an increasing traffic environment”, which realistically aims for the possible results to be achieved and measurable in short-term, 2) “and by this attract modal shift from private car to public transport”, which is long-term.

The defined objectives were in line with the overall mission. Although for the objective “more people travelling on trolley buses and buses”, to be fully in line with the mission's first part, should have said “more or at least the same number of people travelling on trolley buses and buses”.

The objectives were specific, measurable, appropriate, realistic and timed. They could not have been any more specific regarding values, as no comparable data exists in Gdynia on which we could have based our estimations. (This pilot action has provided us with such data.)

Target group

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

The target group was identified correctly but in too much detail. The mission was to get more people using PT and fewer cars. This general approach was correctly reflected in the indicators chosen for monitoring and evaluation. Division of that group into subgroups would have been more justified if in addition to introducing ITS, some forms of behavioural change campaign was undertaken.

Activities

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

The analysis showed that ITS has changed the traffic situation on Morska St. Therefore we can say that the chosen activities of the pilot action were correctly chosen to reach the objectives. Ideally to make the effects of the pilot action more visible, more intersections could have been chosen on a longer stretch and more trolley buses could have been equipped with computers to call priority.

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

The chosen activities were specific, measurable, appropriate, realistic (up scaling the pilot action would be ideal but due to financial limits that was not possible). They were from the start defined as SMART.

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

Pilot Action Implementation

Stakeholder

Identification

Were all relevant stakeholders identified?

All the relevant stakeholders were identified.

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

Did the stakeholders affect the PA as foreseen?

Relevant stakeholder groups:

People who use cars – from the travel analysis we can see that they were affected.
People who most often use public transport – no formal survey was performed but from questions asked randomly to people travelling by public transport on that route, most notice a difference in the travel time but when going in the direction away from the city centre. People don't notice a difference between before and after implementing ITS, they feel the quality of travel is poor when travelling during hush hours.

SUTP group established for the BUSTRIP project - the group did not gain as much as possible due to some delay in implementing the pilot action and delivering the results of the traffic analysis, but for the SUT-P itself the pilot action and evaluation are as foreseen.

Tyco Fire and Integrated Solutions Ltd. (the company responsible for providing the technology and implementing ITS) and with Budizol Plc. (the company responsible for implementing ITS) – their role was underestimated in the whole undertaking regarding how time consuming it will be to finalise all the formal aspects of the installing ITS.

ZKM (public transport company responsible for bus and trolleybus transport) – we did not foresee that there could be a problem regarding the understanding of how ITS works. The drivers of the 50 trolleybuses expected that priorities at traffic lights would allow them to almost not have to stop at intersections, they did not realize that priority at traffic lights mean that green light is longer for them if the vehicle is detected to be approaching traffic lights or if already waiting for green light, the red is approx. 10 sec shorter. We organized a training for drivers after receiving feedback from them that ITS was not working. We should have foreseen this problem before and not assume that they will understand how ITS functions or that they will feel no need to understand it.

Transport companies, the Port – the effect of the Pilot Action on the companies was not analysed. From the traffic analysis we see that there is less freight traffic on that stretch of Morska St.

Consultation

What is your view of the stakeholder consultation?

- How did the communication with the stakeholders work?
- How did the stakeholders show commitment for PA?

The stakeholders

- How did the stakeholder consultation improve the PA implementation and outcome?

Ask the stakeholders about their perspective of PA



Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

- Do you feel well informed about the PA?
- Are you satisfied with your involvement in the PA implementation?
- Are you satisfied with the implementation and outcome of the PA?
- Are you interested in a continuation of cooperation with the municipality?

There was little stakeholder consultations. No survey has been performed on people's awareness of the pilot project, but questions asked randomly to people travelling by public transport on that route. This can be improved in the future - to communicate more with the public.

Regular meetings and consultations with the involved companies - with Tyco Fire and Integrated Solutions Ltd. (the company responsible for providing the technology and implementing ITS) and with Budizol Plc. (the company building a supermarket along Morska St. and responsible for implementing ITS). The contract between Gdynia Municipality and Budizol Plc. was not specified enough and was sometimes interpreted by the two sides differently and communication was sometimes hard.

Several meetings

Not enough consultations were held with ZKM (public transport company responsible for bus and trolleybus transport) which later resulted in the drivers not being fully informed of how ITS works.

Implementation steps

Did we do what we planned to do? Have all activities been implemented as described in the PAPR?

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

The pilot action was as planned implemented in three steps.

The first was the travel and traffic analysis before installing ITS – as planned, in November 2006.

The second was implementing ITS, which was to be done by April 2007, but was delayed and was finished in July 2007. The delay was due to the fact that the contract between Gdynia Municipality and Budizol Plc. for implementing ITS was not specific enough regarding time limitations.

Another reason for the delay is that when writing the time plan we underestimated the time needed to complete all formalities.

Despite the delay, all the planned activities for installing ITS on Morska Street have been done.

The third step was the travel and traffic analysis carried out after the installing of ITS. It was expected to be June 2007 but due to the delay of the second step we had to change the time of conducting the analysis. We postponed it until after summer holidays and as

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

the previous analysis was conducted in November, that was the best time for doing the second measurements.

The travel and traffic analysis – the two parts were done correctly, are comparable and show changes occurring after installing ITS.

Budget

Did the budget worked as planned? Describe the deviations and how they have affected the outcome!

The budget worked as planned: Gdynia did not contribute to the costs of implementing ITS. It was financed by a food chain company as part of a contract with Gdynia to build a supermarket along Morska Street.

Gdynia financed the travel and traffic analysis, as planned 24 400 zł (5 560 EUR).

Risks

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

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

The signed contract between Gdynia Municipality and Budizol Plc. for implementing ITS was not specific enough regarding time limitations.

It was good that we took into account the risk of technical complications but organisational aspects were still not foreseen to take so long. Due to this legal risks were not foreseen. The delay in implementing ITS was a problem. Due to this the scheduled time for performing the second part of the travel and traffic analysis had to be postponed, which means that an annex had to be signed to the contract with the company doing the survey.

Chosen methods and precision of measurements of travel and traffic analysis might not be satisfactory. A contract has been signed with the company doing the analysis to ensure this risk is avoided.

Assessment & Results

Indicator selection

List the selected indicators and discuss:

- Were the selected indicators relevant for the activities and objectives of the PA?
- Are there any indicators which could have been more relevant?

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

Mission
Improve or at least keep the quality of public transport in an increasing traffic environment and by this attract modal shift from private car to public transport

Objective What do we want to achieve?	Indicator of Progress What indicators show whether we are achieving what we set out to achieve?
Increase quality of PT on Morska Street	Travel time of PT vehicles
	Travel time of vehicles other than PT
	Traffic intensity on crossroads
Modal more bus passengers	Number of bus passengers

Activity What do we want to do?	Indicator of Activity What indicators show what we did?
Install ITS for priority schemes for public transport at crossroads on Morska Street	Number of trolley buses and buses equipped with ITS
	Number of cross roads equipped with ITS



Evaluation of Pilot Action – Background

Indicator definition

Indicator of Progress	Description (Location/ Quality, etc.)	Unit	Methods of measurement	Sources of data	Time/ frequency of measurement
Travel time of PT vehicles	Morska St	Min	Survey	means of transport – buses, trolley buses	before and after installing ITS
Travel time of vehicles other than PT	Morska St	Min	Survey	means of transport – cars, vans etc.	before and after installing ITS
Traffic intensity on crossroads	Morska St	No. of vehicles	cables, count	means of transport	before and after installing ITS
Number of bus passengers	Morska St	No. of people	data from public transport vehicles	means of public transport	Afternoon peak hours, before and after installing ITS
Indicator of Activity	Description (Location/ Quality, etc.)	Unit	Methods of measurement	Sources of data	Time/ frequency of measurement
Number of trolley buses and buses equipped with ITS	Morska St, chosen vehicles	No. of computers	Count	Buses, trolley buses, Project plans	After installing ITS
Number of cross roads equipped with ITS	Morska St, chosen crossroads	No. of controllers, loop/video detectors, traffic lights, pedestrian detectors	Count	Cross roads, Project plans	After installing ITS

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring process

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

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.)?

An “after” study of traffic will be conducted. Traffic analysis will concern the overall changes in traffic i.e. traffic flow, traffic conditions at intersections and public transport. The impacts can generally be divided into efficiency and quality of service related. The data for each indicator (see above table) will be collected using methods like personal surveys, site surveys, records and count.

For now only this travel analysis has been planned and organised to monitor the effects ITS brings, but another analysis might be performed within a year of this one to show further development in changes.

Indicators data collection

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

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

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.)?

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

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

Need to be improved. Stakeholders need to be more involved – consulted and informed.

- o Implementation of action and Risk assessment

Contracts need to be more precise not leaving any space for interpretations. The contract with Budizol was the first of these kind of contracts with investors and this mistake in constructing a contract has since then been avoided. To omit any technical problems in the future we are constructing other contracts with investors in a different way.

- o Indicator selection
- o Monitoring and evaluation

Lessons learnt

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

Success – the effect - targets have been reached and mission achieved.

Failure – not enough people know about our pilot action, we did not inform them enough or promote and disseminate our work enough.

Barriers – legal aspects, documentation needs. Not enough people working only on and coordinating one task (pilot action).

Problem – not taking into account the barriers and leaving enough time in the time schedule to solve them.

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

Any documentation (such as contracts) has to be legally air-tight.

Stakeholders need to be consulted and informed.

Our work has to be disseminated and promoted – especially on the local level.