**Summary of the results of the PA 3 impact evaluation**

**Summary of the impact evaluation preparation**

The impact evaluation was preceded by several months of communication within the programming and evaluation department. In this sense, the "Working group for the management of the evaluation for the OPII of the MTC SR" was also established, which at the first meeting, in addition to approving the statute and rules of procedure, also commented on evaluation questions for PO 3, PO 6 (specific objective 6.2 of first-class roads). Since the signing of the terms of reference at the end of January 2022, there has been intensive communication between the client and the team of evaluators.

**Conclusion and recommendations of evaluators**

The aim of the *"Impact assessment of projects financed under priority axis no. 3 Public passenger transport OP Integrated infrastructure 2014 – 2020"* was to evaluate whether the result indicators were achieved and, above all, what impact ESIF financial interventions had on their achievement. By its very nature, the impact assessment does not provide room for questions regarding changes in the field of output and result indicators, but points to the impact of the intervention on the changes made and the achievement of specific goals.

The evaluated projects solved some urgent problems of the renewal of urban transport systems in an effort to maintain traffic service for residents, prevent the declining interest of residents in public transport and the deterioration of the traffic situation in cities. Projects could not solve all problems. The problem of further development, maintenance of modern and currently adequate transportation of residents in larger cities and their surroundings remains unsolved, especially bearing the financial burden associated with their permanent functioning and development.

The evaluation team was able to provide a vague answer regarding **question no. 1** *Has the competitiveness of public passenger transport increased compared to individual passenger transport as a result of modernization and reconstruction for urban rail transport?* **and questions no. 3** *Has the attractiveness and accessibility of public passenger transport increased compared to individual passenger transport as a result of the renewal of mobile means of transport of rail public transport (i.e. trams and trolleybuses)?* In this sense, there has not been a big shift regarding the division of transport work after the implementation of projects in favour of public transport. The division of transport work, despite the modernization and reconstruction of track-based public transport and the renewal of transport mobile means, showed more or less the same values ​​as before the implementation of the projects. This fact is influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic, when people began to prefer individual transport (walking, scooter, bicycle, but also car). At the same time, however, the evaluator states that by implementing the projects we have achieved a stabilization of the division of transport work without significant deterioration in favour of individual car transport (ICT). However, the modernization of transport means has brought with it several benefits. An increase in the safety of transport means (in some projects, the accident rate has increased, which may be mainly related to the human factor), the provision of barrier-free access, technical improvements (introduction of monitors), increased comfort due to air-conditioned spaces, as well as reducing travel time. The growing demands of the public are directly proportional to their demands in the 21st century, and it is unlikely that public transport would be able to stabilize or to reverse the development in favour of ICT without the modernization carried out.

**Question no. 2** *Did the investments from OPII funds allocated to modernization and reconstruction for IDS and for urban rail transport have an impact on reducing negative impacts on the environment (noise load, CO2, NO2 and PM10 emissions)?* **and question no. 4** *Did the interventions from the OPII funds allocated to the renewal of the mobile means of public transport have an impact on reducing the negative effects on the environment (noise load, CO2, NO2 and PM10 emissions)?* **were not possible to be sufficiently evaluated** due to the fact that the transport companies do not have the given data, and that is why it is not possible to evaluate or answer the given questions to the desired degree. For the projects, data were provided regarding savings/increased emissions, which were based only on reduced/increased consumption of traction energy. Based on our warning that transport companies are not obliged to keep statistics and do not have to have the given data, **we recommended to the evaluators that the calculations cannot be based only on savings in traction energy. Other variables must be counted like the energy demand of mobile vehicles, savings due to a lower failure rate, the number of transported persons in compared with the period before the implementation of the project.** These variables should then be recalculated per person at the average transport capacity of individual vehicles, which should be in contrast with mobile means before modernization, or compared to the use of ICT at full or minimum capacity of the vehicle. Such analysis procedures require more qualitative calculations, which were not carried out due to lack of time. Therefore, in the conclusion, only the recalculation of the total savings in traction energy and the related emission savings is given (even such a procedure is not the most correct, because some mobile vehicles had a lower transport capacity, which directly affects the total emission savings). The same problem arose with the issue of noise. It was necessary to compare the noise of mobile devices before and after the implementation of the project (after their replacement). Since the measurements were not carried out, the evaluators concluded that it was impossible to evaluate this question. We warned them that it is necessary to compare at least the noise level of mobile devices based on their technical data sheets, given by the manufacturer. Noise before and after the implementation of the modernization of railway transport was carried out in one project.

**Question no. 5** was answered accurately, but was probably not asked appropriately. *"Has the intervention (new energy-efficient vehicles with modern drive) reduced repair and maintenance costs?"* The logical answer is yes. Replacing obsolete vehicles with new ones means automatic savings (also due to the 36-month warranty period) on repairs, wages (employees did not repair new mobile vehicles) and other vehicle repair and maintenance costs. The issue that needs to be solved methodically in the future is the "*problem of the warranty period and its projection into the costs of repairs and the cost of equipping workshops with new devices and equipment required for new vehicles." We therefore recommend making the reported savings of this type of cost conditional on an analytical justification of its eligibility, timing and in terms of its annual amount. Monitor these costs at least 5 years after the end of the project (3 years guarantee and 2 post-project years) and for comparison with the costs at least 5 years before the project."*

The comparative analysis of the benefits of the selected projects resulted in the **following recommendations:**

1. **Project preparation stage**
2. MA is to assess, using economic criteria, whether the proposed investment is sufficiently effective and what the benefit will be;
3. to unify the method of recording costs according to types and follow it also in calculations, reports and also in project documentation.
4. **Project development stage**
5. coordination and cooperation of local governments with environmental departments and demand that they comment not only on the project and its intentions, but also assess the environmental impact;
6. feasibility studies should contain the results of pre-project measurements of noise, emissions, dust, etc. and in the post-project period, these parameters should be evaluated together with other main indicators of project efficiency;
7. pay attention to the reporting of traction energy consumption and its savings in the stage of processing the feasibility study and in public procurements for public transport vehicles;
8. develop for recipients a set of requirements for warranty periods already when procuring means of transport for public passenger transport and dealing with complaints and costs associated with repairs and maintenance of new means of transport that the carrier has not yet included in the vehicle fleet.
9. **Post-project stage**
10. in the case of national projects above the established contribution limit, the beneficiary should be required to process an ex-post CBA within the impact period, primarily in the part of the economic analysis, which will assess the actual socio-economic benefits from the implemented project and compare them with the anticipated/planned benefits in the preparation stage project.