

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 – Report template

Pilot Action definition

Purpose and scope

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

The Pilot Action Working Team had some clear ideas and lots of wishes about pilot action. The final activities were selected out during process.

Were the defined objectives in line with the overall mission?

YES

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

YES

Target group

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

We have focused to several target groups. During thematic day we tried to reach citizens, politicians and bicycle users. Car free day was a awareness rising event for citizens and “Walk for your health” was targeting everyday car users.

Activities

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

Basically we have reached the target, which was awareness raising about alternatives in city transport. One thing that we discovered very soon was that the media has no interest for positive events in the city what so ever. It has made the things for us more difficult, if we are talking about citizens need for information.

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

As far as we know, yes.

Pilot Action Implementation

Stakeholder

Identification

Were all relevant stakeholders identified?

Stakeholders identification and implementation has been developed naturally. They have shown interest for participating in PA. It was based on earliel cooperation in sustainable transport development.

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

Our experience has shown that more affect is in the case when very specific group is targeted with PA.

Did the stakeholders affect the PA as foreseen?

The interest and affect has been different during the activities, but it has been quite high, most in “Thematic Day” and “Walk for Your Health” campaign.

Consultation

What is your view of the stakeholder consultation?

- o How did the communication with the stakeholders work?

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

- o How did the stakeholders show commitment for PA?
- o How did the stakeholder consultation improve the PA implementation and outcome?

The communication with stakeholders on PA was part of overall stakeholder communication plan which have contained regular meetings, seminars and mailing lists. PA team started with organizing meetings before every PA event. The team was build of stakeholders and city representatives. The team specified a plan for event, needed recourses and role for every member. In every part of PA the stakeholders involvement has been on significant level.

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?

The Stakeholders were mainly satisfied about PA. There were some critical comments about how the PA activities were taken place (for example missing schedule for visitors). All suggestions were collected after PA. One problem was that not all stakeholders did not agree with others on some important issues. The discussion was about where the Car Free Day event should take place, should it be in a street or in a parking area. But all stakeholders were relatively satisfied in the end. The team is hoping that cooperation between city and other stakeholders will continue in the future.

Implementation steps

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

Basically, YES. It was not so radical as some Stakeholders wanted and we also fail in participating International Network of Car Free Day but the main idea about promoting non-car solutions in city transportation was successful.

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

First of all, we made 3 PA activities instead of one:

- Car Free Day 2006
- Thematic Day (Spring 2007)
- Car Free Day 2007.

I believe that the Thematic Day was the most successful one all thou it was the cheapest. The reason was that it was very directly oriented for its target group (potential bicycle users) instead of large doing-all event like Car Free Day. Thematic Day is our success story.

The other successful event was also the idea that was not described in PARP. The walking promotion "Walk for your health". It has also direct target group (private car users who will volunteer as walkers for 3 months). One of its success indicators was strong support on political level. It was also only event that got national press coverage. The promotion campaign was made as part of Car Free Day 2007 activities.

Budget

Did the budget worked as planned?

Describe the deviations and how they have affected the outcome!

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

The PA team did lot of improvising. This is also the reason why the final budget was several times higher than it was planned. There are some lessons learned during this process. For example, it's not so important how much money is invested to overall publicity. As we made Car Free Day 2006 with no publicity and 2007 with a big advertising campaign - the interest was practically same. The other lesson was that money is important for direct event. The campaign "Walk for your health" had a good budget, lots of money for equipment (pedometers) and health research and it was very popular (and had also major media coverage, which is also important).

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?

One thing that we somehow knew was that there is practically no interest in media for promotion of sustainable transport issues. Exactly that was also happening. There were some short notice about Car Free Day 2006 and 2007 but only "Walk for your health" got a national coverage in newspapers and in TV.

The other risk was the lack of resources. I believe that the PA team could have more effect if there were more people involved for direct activities.

Assessment & Results

Indicator selection

List the selected indicators and discuss:

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

Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring process

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

During the Car Free Day the Team tried to evaluate how many people did participate in activities and how many have just visited the event. Also special questionnaire was made for getting feedback from citizens.

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

Yes, special team of external experts was established for data collecting and analyze.

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

We had to change some indicators. During the CFD 2006 we collected the data about car use but as CFD 2007 was Sunday the output could be not comparable and we did not evaluate this indicator.

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.

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

Indicator	Unit	Start-Value	End-Value	Trend	Comment
Visitors	man	0	2500	pos	It's the evaluated total amount of visitors during 3 PT events
Participators	man	0	76	pos	
Fulfilment	%	0	80	pos	Fulfilment of the area shows how important was the
Political interest	man	1	2	pos	Also the vice major was interested of participating in activities
Media interest	man	0	5	pos	National and local newspapers, national TV and news portal
Overall interest				pos	Everybody seems to agree, that this kind of activity is required and needed.

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.)?

The outcome of PA achieved clearly the objectives: we got an attention of our several stakeholder groups, media etc. If we are talking about change of behaviour then this needs more longer period for measuring.

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
- o Implementation of action
- o Budget
- o Risk assessment
- o Indicator selection
- o Monitoring and evaluation

The problems of the pilot action are mostly related with the methodology and the work of EU projects. It demands that the project partner should have very clear vision what are the main problems in region without doing a special research or working with stakeholders. I don't see how this could work after all in longer term then one year. After that usually the situation and the vision of stakeholders has changed especially in fast developing regions.

Evaluation of Pilot Action – Report template

Lessons learnt

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

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

The project had two success stories in Tartu. First one was the “Thematic Day” which established a secure parking area for bikes in central plaza of the city (right in front of the city government). It was visible had a clear message and worked well for the target group. Although it had zero media coverage but it was also done with very low budget (less than 300 EUR).

The other success was “Walk for your health” campaign which started at Car Free Day in 2007 and lasted 3 months. It was containing three stages: open event at the Car Free Day (22.09) in which all registered members get a) BUSTRIP t-shirt (with EU, INTERREG and BUSTRIP logo), b) step counter (with EU logo), c) flexible reflector for walking in morning/evening time and c) leaflet “Tartu säästev transport 2007” with information about sustainable transport in Tartu and BUSTRIP project. Second stage was the three month period when the participants had to fill the suggested norm of steps and they were monitored by the Clinic of Tartu University. The third event was ceremonial final event, where the most active walkers (more than 1 milj. steps) get promoted (and also some other participants). The campaign was success, more than 70 people was participating and almost all of them made through the whole activity period. It got also remarkable media interest with several news in national TV, newspapers and in the radio. It had budget more than 6 500 EUR.

The lesson from this is that if we are dealing with awareness rising there are possibilities to do things in several scale and you can succeed also with not so big budget. But still, if you are targeting a wider influence (through regional and national media) you need money and support from higher level (for example the patron of walking campaign was the vice major Margus Hanson).

There was also one interesting lesson for dealing with awareness rising. The international Car Free Day was also part of the projects PA and we made it twice – at 2006 and 2007. At first year there were practically no money for advertising and the second year it was vice versa. At 2007 we made huge advertising campaign for Car Free Day and sustainable transport modes. But after all it did not affect the amount of visitors in our Car Free Day event. The lesson from this is that it’s rather hard or difficult to promote a sustainable transport issues with a classical advertising. It demands much smarter approach.