



Annex 3: PIR Generic Offline Template

As of 4 May 2015



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Basic Data / Basic Project & Finance Data

Basic Project Information

PIMS ID	3465
Project Title	Energy Efficiency Improvements in the Indian Brick Industry

Project Contact Information

Role	Name	Email Address
Project Implementing Partner	Mr. R. S. Prasad	ravis.prasad@nic.in
Project Manager/Coordinator	Mr. N. Vasudevan	nvasu@teri.res.in
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer	Dr. S. N. Srinivas	sn.srinivas@undp.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP)	Mr. Susheel Kumar	asmef.susheel@gov.in
Other Partners		

Project Milestones and Timeframe

Revised planned closing date	<p><i>Note: This is the date when the project is expected to have completed the terminal evaluation and is operationally closed in ATLAS. The planned closing date included in the UNDP project document can only be revised if a no-cost extension has been officially approved from the UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator. Please upload this non-cost extension approval to the APPROVE and SUBMIT tab of the PIR. No project can be extended without this approval.</i></p> <p>31 December 2015</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Project Supervision

Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2013 to 1 July 2014)	In the absence of approved action plan since 1 st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity. A meeting was chaired by NPD on 6 th May 2015 to discuss about the annual action plan 2015. The meeting was attended by TERI and UNDP.
---	--

Terminal PIR

Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report?	Yes
--	-----

General Comments on Basic Data

Please insert additional comments not explained above.

The project was on hold since July 2011 pending compliance to audit observations and addressing recommendations of MTR. TERI has now agreed to re-programme the project activities. TERI, Ministry and UNDP had discussions and converged on addressing recommendations made by MTR. AWP 2015 activities have been defined.

A narration is given below on the progress made till the time project was active. The total number of brick kilns that availed technical assistance from the project and producing REBs was nine. Three of them were producing REB on pilot basis before the start of project. All these nine entrepreneurs are producing both REBs and solid bricks. It is estimated that 9.6 million REB were produced during 2010 & 2011. As on Dec 2011, these units have reduced 8,783 tCO₂ [2010 & 2011]. As no data was gathered, it were all estimated numbers. The following paragraphs provide outcome-wise progress;

Towards outcome 1, Enhancing public sector awareness on resource efficient products, following work was done; [i] 12 cluster meetings, 2 awareness buildings were carried out where the above stakeholders participated. 930 people participated in these meetings. They include brick entrepreneurs, architects, builders, government officials, central & state public works departments, Bureau of Indian Standard, Central & state urban development bodies, National Building Code, and Military Engineering Services; [ii] A short video film 'construction practices with REB's' was prepared, distributed and uploaded on the project website; [iii] Participated in two trade shows; and [iv] TERI is member of BIS committee. Proposal for REB inclusion under standards has been placed to BIS. TERI participated in many meetings of BIS. TERI proposed to BIS to consider revision of IS 2222: 1991(existing standard on 'Specification for burnt clay perforated building bricks' especially with respect to requirements of perforations in the clay-fired bricks.

Towards outcome 2: Access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs following activities were completed; [i] 5 model DPRs prepared by LRCs, 2 by TERI - Southern region, 1 by TERI Northern region, rest by other LRCs]. The annual production capacities and investments in Indian Rupees for 5 model DPRs are; manufacturing unit capable to produce 3 million bricks annually cost INR 10,800,000. Similarly 5.2 million bricks annually costs INR 25,000,000; 10 million bricks annually costs INR 26,200,000; 16 million bricks annually costs INR 49,600,000; and 20.9 million bricks cost INR 54,300,000 and [ii] Karnataka State Finance Corporation has reviewed and concurred to the DPRs and in principle agreeable to provide loans.

Towards outcome 3: Improved knowledge on technology including marketing following activities were completed. Total addition of REBs due to project estimated is 9.6 million bricks in two years. In year 1, 2010 was 6.6 bricks and in year 2, 2011 was 6.6 million. [i] Many knowledge products such as approach paper, film, simulation modeling, draft manual on construction of REBs, were prepared, [ii] One international conference organized in north, one interactive meeting in south and four business to business meetings were organized. In all 700 people attended and benefited from these meetings and [iii] Enabling actions such as laboratory testing of REB samples were tested at accredited laboratory. The tests have provided results indicating that the REBs conform to the existing BIS standards on physical and thermal parameters except the thermal conductivity for which Indian laboratories are not equipped.

Towards outcome 4: Availability of resource efficient technologies, following activities was completed, namely; 9 brick manufacturing units were directly or indirectly supported by the project continued with REB production. A summary of achievements as reported earlier is provided here as ready reference; [i] Pryag bricks at Varanasi, [ii] Bharat bricks at Derabassi, [iii] Dadoo bricks, Hapur, [iv] Kusum bricks at Hapur, [v] Sai Nath bricks at Gaziabad, [vi] Jai Jalaram bricks at Godhra, [vii] Sri Venkateshwara bricks & tiles, Kolar, [viii] Anjaneya bricks, Hosakote and [ix] Sri Marikamba bricks, Malur.

Towards outcome 5: Improved capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs, following activities were completed. The efforts made by project during the active part of the project may have resulted into action in the sector. Most relevant activities for this outcome are; [i] 3 cluster meetings by three LRCs in North, South and East were conducted creating awareness and [ii] 3 exposure visits organized at South to Wienerberger production unit.

Development Objective Progress / Progress Toward Development Objectives

Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2014	Level at 30 June 2015
The goal of the project is to reduce energy consumption and restrict GHG emissions by creating appropriate infrastructure for sustained adoption of energy efficient technologies for production and use of resource efficient bricks. The focus will be on making at least five major brick producing clusters more energy efficient by enhancing (i) public sector awareness on resource-efficient products, (ii) access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs, (iii) knowledge on technology and marketing, (iv) availability of resource efficient technology models through Local Resource Centres, and (v) capacities of brick kiln entrepreneurs.	Reduction of 187,840 tonnes of CO ₂ in five major brick making clusters in India over 15 years	0	Year 1: reduction of 10,099 tCO ₂ Year 5: reduction of 59,920 tCO ₂ Year 10: reduction of 123,880 tCO ₂ Year 15: reduction of 187,840 tCO ₂	In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project was not able to engage the REB producers and therefore no data is available for reporting. The progress made till June 2013 is reproduced. 9 brick kiln units in different regions of the country facilitated under the project are producing REBs. Of these, 3 brick kiln units had produced REBs on pilot basis before the start of the project. The existing REB producers have increased their production and now they are producing REBs every year. The brick kiln entrepreneurs producing conventional solid bricks have also shown interest in this product and have started producing REBs. A total of 8,783 tonnes of CO ₂ emissions has been reduced till December 2011. (This does not include CO ₂ reduction from REB production from the year 2012 as on 30 June 2014).	As reported earlier, the total number of brick kilns producing REBs remains nine. Three of them were producing REB on pilot basis before the start of project. These entrepreneurs are producing both REBs and solid bricks. As on Dec 2011, these units have reduced 8,783 tCO ₂ . No further assessment has taken place since then.
Outcome 1: Enhancing public sector awareness on resource efficient products	Usage of REBs by new public department building contracts increased by 20% by end of project.	No increase in usage of EE bricks in public buildings	Year 2: Increase by 3% Year 3 : Increase by 10% Year 4: Increase by 20%	In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity. Thus the report on activities remains the same as presented earlier. However, cumulative summary of progress is presented below [till June 2013]; 9.6 million (3.0 million in year 2010, 6.6 million in year 2011) REBs were produced cumulatively from	TERI is a member of the CED-30 committee of Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS). TERI continued to participate in the follow up meetings. TERI participated in 10 th meeting of clay and stabilized soil products held at BIS office, New Delhi on 21 st April 2014. The meeting was chaired by Dr. A.K. Minocha, Chairman CED-30 committee, BIS. TERI proposed to BIS to consider revision of IS 2222:

			<p>the start of the project from the project supported nine units. The production accounts to approximately 20% of the total production of the units which started producing REBs with project support. The total brick production per year is about 1.4 billion per year. Hence percentage achieved is 0.5% vis-à-vis a target of 3%.</p> <p>A variety of stakeholders have been sensitised on REBs and related technologies through the events mentioned below and these include 850 brick entrepreneurs, 80 architects and builders and government officials from relevant departments such as the Central and State Public Works Departments, Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS), Central and State Urban Development Bodies, National Building Code (NBC) and Military Engineering Services: (1) Twelve cluster meetings organized in Gujarat (Ahmedabad), Haryana (Rohtak, Jhajjar, Panipat), Punjab (Ludhiana, Amristar, Gurdaspur, Bhatinda), Rajasthan (Hanuman garh, Ganga Nagar), Tamil Nadu (Chennai), and Karnataka (Malur) to convince the brick kiln entrepreneurs to start producing REBs; (2) Two awareness building workshops were organized in Meerut (Uttar Pradesh) and Coimbatore (Tamil Nadu) to introduce REBs as an energy efficient walling material to architects; (3) A short video film on “Construction practices with REBs” was prepared and uploaded on the project website; (4) Two focus group discussions were organised at New Delhi and Bangalore with government departments that are mass consumers of bricks in order to promote REB usage among them; (5) to promote the use of REBs by architects, the project participated and put up stalls in the following exhibitions: India International Trade Fair, New Delhi, November 2010; National Convention of Architects organised by Indian Architects Association, December 2010 (6) project brochure shared with about 600 stakeholders (7) Discussions were held with Weinerberger (a large REB producer) for training and capacity building to further propagate REBs (8) Continued interactions with CPWD, NBC and BIS for inclusion of REBs in their schedule and standards (9) 7 meetings were organised with government officials and builders /</p>	<p>1991(existing standard on ‘Specification for burnt clay perforated building bricks” especially with respect to requirements of perforations in the clay-fired bricks. During the meeting, it was decided that Chairman CED-30 committee and TERI will jointly review the existing standard and will provide their consolidated view for any amendment / revision of the existing standard for consideration in the next committee meeting. Summary of earlier work is as given below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 cluster meetings, 2 awareness buildings were carried out where the above stakeholders participated. The project has reached out to about 930 brick entrepreneurs, architects, builders, government officials, central & state public works departments, Bureau of Indian Standard, Central & state urban development bodies, National Building Code, and Military Engineering Services. • A short video film ‘construction practices with REB’s’ was prepared, distributed and uploaded on the project website. • Participated in two trade shows. • TERI is member of BIS committee. Proposal for REB inclusion under standards has been placed to BIS. TERI participated in many meetings of BIS.
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>architects (10) A study on structural stability using REBs has been planned with support from IIT-Roorkee.</p> <p>In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project did not undertake any activity. However, TERI as member of the Civil Engineering Department (CED) -30 committee of Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) participated in the 9th meeting of clay and stabilized soil products held at BIS office, New Delhi on 20th March 2013. TERI proposed the BIS to consider revision of IS 2222: 1991 to include perforations in the clay-fired bricks. During the meeting, it was decided that Dr. J.M. Bhatnagar, Chairman CED-30 committee and TERI will jointly review the existing standard and will provide their consolidated view for any amendment / revision of the existing standard for consideration in the next committee meeting.</p>	
<p>Outcome 2: Access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs.</p>	<p>Loans from local banks/ financial institutions for technology upgradation tripled by end of project</p>	<p>Loans for REB technologies in brick kiln sector will not increase</p>	<p>Year 3 - Loans doubled as compared to baseline year</p> <p>Year-4 : Loans tripled as compared to baseline year</p>	<p>In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity.</p> <p>Since the project inception a total of 5 model DPRs covering different production capacities were prepared by LRCs. In addition, 3 more model DPRs have already been prepared by LRCs (2 by LRC-Southern region and 1 by LRC-Northern region) under the project with following salient features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production Capacities: 52, 100, 160, 109, 30 lakh bricks per annum • Total investment: Rs. 250 lakhs, 262 lakhs, 496 lakhs, 543 lakh, 108 lakhs respectively • Salient components: Firing in new BTK/High draft kiln; 4th and 5th are Extruder (6500 bricks/hr.), Chamber dryer with firing in Hoffman kiln/natural drying under shed and firing in existing BTK. <p>To sensitize the bank / financial institution on brick kiln sector in general and on REBs in particular, one to one meetings were organized with them by LRCs in their respective regions. Based on the discussion, two banks / financial institutes have reviewed the DPRs and given their in-principle consent [Karnataka State Financial Corporation & Corporation bank] to</p>	<p>No activity undertaken during the reporting period.</p> <p>Thus the achievements remain as reported in previous year, i.e.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 model DPRs prepared by LRCs, 2 by TERI - Southern region, 1 by TERI Northern region, rest by other LRCs]. The annual production capacities and investments in Indian Rupees for 5 model DPRs are; 30,00,000 bricks cost INR 108,00,000; 52,00,000 bricks costs INR 250,00,000; 100,00,000 bricks costs INR 262,00,000;;160,00,000 bricks costs INR 496,00,000; and 209,00,000 bricks cost INR 543,00,000. • Karnataka State Finance Corporation has reviewed and concurred to the DPRs and in principle agreeable to provide loans.

				provide loans to interested brick kiln entrepreneurs based on these DPRs.	
Outcome 3: Improved knowledge on technology including marketing.	REBs sold in the market and used for construction.	Market share of resource efficient bricks remains low.	Market share of resource-efficient bricks doubled by end of project	<p>In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity</p> <p>From the nine units supported under the project so far, 9.6 million (3.0 million in year 2010, 6.6 million in year 2011) REBs were produced cumulatively from the project start date. The total brick production in India per year is about 1.4 billion. When compared to this number, the current market share of REBs is very low.</p> <p>(1) Approach Paper on Developing Markets for REBs prepared and shared with key stakeholders; (2) Laboratory testing of representative REB samples (perforated and hollow) and solid bricks was carried out in National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories (NABL) accredited labs to establish their physical and thermal parameters such as compressive strength, water absorption and efflorescence, specific heat capacity (at 50°C). The results indicate that the physical properties of the REBs conform to the existing BIS standards. However, the thermal conductivity could not be tested as the required facilities are not available with leading laboratories in India; (3) A film focusing on improving construction practices of masons using REBs was prepared and uploaded on the project web-site; (4) The draft of study using simulation modeling to showcase the material and monetary savings with REB use has been prepared (5) Draft manual on better construction practices with REBs prepared (6) International conference was organised on "Mechanisation in Brick Industry" at Chandigarh. 550 stakeholders participated including government officials, architects and brick kiln entrepreneurs from 14 states (Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttaranchal, Jammu & Kashmir West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Tripura. At this event, machinery suppliers had put up stall to showcase their technologies. A local bank (Corporation Bank)</p>	<p>No activity was undertaken during the reporting period. Thus the achievement under this outcome remains as reported earlier, highlights are presented below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total addition due to project estimated is 9.6 million bricks in two years. In year 1, 2010 was 6.6 bricks and in year 2, 2011 was 6.6 million. • Many knowledge products such as approach paper, film, simulation modeling, draft manual on construction of REBs, were prepared • One international conference organized in north, one interactive meeting in south and four business to business meetings were organized. In all 700 people attended and benefited from these meetings. • Enabling actions such as laboratory testing of REB samples were tested at accredited laboratory. The tests have provided results indicating that the REBs conform to the existing BIS standards on physical and thermal parameters except the thermal conductivity for which Indian laboratories are not equipped.

				<p>had also put up a stall to market loans to REBs. The event was widely covered by the media;</p> <p>(7) An interactive meeting was organised between 70 potential brick kiln entrepreneurs of the Southern region and technology supplier Walter Craven on 23 June 2011.</p> <p>There has been no specific assessment done on the market share of REBs since the inception of project. Towards sensitizing & educating end-users on REBs, the project has undertaken:</p> <p>(i) Simulation modeling study to showcase benefits of using REBs in place of other convention materials for construction has been completed by LRC – Western region and the same has been uploaded on project web-site. The inputs of various stakeholders like LRCs, brick kiln entrepreneurs and practicing architects were used to finalise this document.</p> <p>(ii) Web based manual on better construction practices using REBs has been completed by LRC- Western region. The manual briefly describes appropriate bonding details, wall and roof details, etc with their construction stages.</p> <p>(iii) Booklet on use of REBs for construction prepared by sector expert (practicing architect) which covers the general features of REBs and their use in construction for various components of building like Walls, Lintel, Roofs, support systems etc.</p> <p>(iv) Four (4) B2B (Business to Business) meetings organized between Technology Suppliers and brick kiln entrepreneurs: comprising 2 Indian manufacturers; 9 European manufacturers; and 1 Chinese manufacturer.</p>	
<p>Outcome 4: Availability of resource efficient technologies.</p>	<p>12 energy efficient brick kiln units established in 5 clusters by end of the project.</p>	<p>No EE brick kiln units established</p>	<p>All 12 units established by year-1</p>	<p>In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity. However, overall progress under this component in previous years is presented below;</p> <p>9 brick kiln units which were facilitated under the project (Pryag bricks at Varanasi; Bharat bricks at Derabassi; Dadoo bricks and Kusum bricks at Hapur; Sai Nath bricks at Ghaziabad; Jai Jalaram bricks at Godhra; Sri Venkateshwara Bricks & Tiles at Kolar; Anjaneya Bricks at Hoskote and Sri Marikamba bricks at Malur) continued the REB production during the year.</p>	<p>No additional manufacturing facility producing REB was supported directly under the project during the reporting period. However, it is expected that the 9 units which were directly or indirectly supported by the project continued with REB production. A summary of achievements as reported earlier is provided here as ready reference;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pryag bricks at Varanasi 2. Bharat bricks at Derabassi 3. Dadoo bricks, Hapur 4. Kusum bricks at Hapur 5. Sai Nath bricks at Gaziabad

				A total of 66 lakh REBs were produced during the year 2010 and 2011.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Jai Jalaram bricks at Godhra 7. Sri Venkateshwara bricks & tiles, Kolar 8. Anjaneya bricks, Hosakote 9. Sri Marikamba bricks, Malur
Outcome 5: Improved capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs.	At least 5 brick kiln entrepreneurs in each cluster invest in technology upgradation by end of the project.	No investment done on REB technology adoption	<p>Year 2 : 1 entrepreneur in each cluster invests</p> <p>Year 4: 5 entrepreneurs in each cluster invest.</p>	<p>In the absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity. However, cumulative progress is presented below;</p> <p>There has been no investment made on REB technologies by the REB entrepreneurs. But towards this outcome the capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs on technology up gradation and REB production have been strengthened through the following events:</p> <p>(i) 3 cluster meetings, one each at Ludhiana, Nawanshahar (Punjab) and Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh) by LRC- North and LRC- East respectively. During these meetings, subject matter experts from LRCs discussed with brick kiln entrepreneurs about the available technological options and benefits of REBs. The REB producer/ leading brick kiln entrepreneur of the region also shared their experience and future plans about technology up gradation with the brick kiln entrepreneurs during these meetings. It is expected that about 5 to10 more brick kiln entrepreneurs of these regions will go for technology upgradation in their kiln during the next brick making season.</p> <p>(ii) 3 exposure visits organised by LRC- South, one each at Wienerberger production unit near Bangalore, brick kiln unit near Chennai using Chinese machinery and Indian Tile Conference at Kanyakumari.</p> <p>(iii) One business meeting with international technology supplier at Malur.</p> <p>(iv) A video film of the masons training program that was organized at Wienerberger mason's training facility on 13 April 2011 prepared highlights the construction practices to be followed during use of REBs for construction.</p>	<p>No additional activity was taken up during the reporting period. However, the efforts made by project during the active part of the project may have resulted into action in the sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 cluster meetings by three LRCs in North, South and East were conducted creating awareness. • 3 exposure visits organized at South to Wienerberger production unit.

Development Objectives Rating

<p>Project Manager / Coordinator is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. <p>Since the project could not undertake any project related activities in the absence of approved action plan for the reporting period, no rating is provided. (S)</p> <p>Project activities were successfully implemented till 31st December 2011 as per the approved AWP's for the year 2009, 2010 and 2011. However, in absence of approved action plan since 1st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity. However, there is a need to revise the log-frame of the project.</p>
<p>UNDP Country Office Programme Officer is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. <p>MS</p> <p>The project started in 2009 and was active till mid July 2011. Subsequently it was put on hold as there were audit issues and recommendations by mid term review to make adjustments to the project. Audit issues include higher manpower</p>

charges charged by TERI when compared to what was approved in the CEO endorsement document. UNDP asked TERI to either refund the excess amount charged or reprogramme the same. After a long time, TERI has agreed to reprogramme the same. MTR recommendations included reduction of number of Local Resource Centre [LRC] from five to two so that the project can focus in the balance of time, optimal use of balance funds and revision of LFA and involving the northern LRC, Punjab State Council for Science & Technology more actively, as they have contributed significantly.

After TERI agreed to reprogramming, AWP has been developed for 2015 which is under signature now. Part 1 of AWP is for an amount of USD 73,000, envisages carrying out activities to reprogramme to cover the excess charges made by TERI. The activities will be implemented by TERI. Part 2 AWP is to carry out another set of activities. In part 2 AWP, two activities will be conducted by TERI, four will be outsourced through UNDP and two are proposed to be implemented by PSCST. The project also aims to commission terminal evaluation towards the end of year 2015.

The project may not achieve all indicators set under objectives and outcomes in the set time frame in the original LFA in the prodoc. Following are different aspects for not achieving the same.

- Firstly, the project lost momentum since it has been on hold for over two years now. It took a long time to resolve audit issues and make adjustments recommended by the MTR consultants. However, now that these are resolved and an action plan is in place.
- Secondly, the project may not achieve the total GHG reductions targeted 187,840 tCO₂ during the project period. This assumed all the 12 new REB facilities will come up in year 1 itself which was not possible. In two years of its active operation, it has achieved only 8,783 tCO₂.
- Thirdly, achieving the target of 20% increase in REB usage is uncertain. Project anticipated that REB specifications will be included in contract documents of the public departments is uncertain. This would have provided lot of demand for REBs. As the project realized most public departments look forward to inclusion of REB in Bureau of Indian Standards before REBs can be included in contract documents. Now the project is working on this additional step.

There was no progress in terms of implementation of activities during the reporting period. However, several rounds of discussions took place between, TERI, UNDP, and MoEFCC to resolve the audit issues, consider the recommendations made by MTR and move on. Now these have converged, activities have been identified for reprogramming as well as balance of activities

	<p>[to reasonably fulfil the commitment made in the prodoc] into finalizing the AWP 2015. I provide a rating of Unsatisfactory for the project. The next steps include implementing AWP 2015 part 1 by TERI and part 2 by TERI, UNDP and PSCST.</p>
<p>GEF Operational Focal point is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.</p>	<p>HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
	[DO rating in 2015]
	[comments]
<p>Project Implementing Partner is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
	[DO rating in 2015]
	[comments]
	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.</p>

<p>Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).</p>	<p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
	[DO rating in 2015]
	[comments]
<p>UNDP Technical Adviser is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.</p> <p>Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date? <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective). 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
	Unsatisfactory (U)
	<p>Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. The midterm review mission was conducted during February/March 2012. It took many months for the review team to finalise the report, as the responsible party i.e. TERI could not agree on its findings. Eventually the MTR report was finalised in October 2012. MTR raised several issues that are quite valid. Apart from this, there was an audit observation. Following these, TERI in its capacity as responsible party did not agree to sign the AWP 2012, AWP 2013 and AWP 2014. No steady progress is being made towards achieving the end-of-project targets as per the indicators outlined in the DO tab. The project was on hold since 2012 pending compliance to audit observations and addressing recommendations of MTR. Finally, in 2015, TERI has agreed to re-programme the project activities to the amount they are due to the project (from excess man-day rates charged to the project). TERI, Ministry and UNDP had a number of discussions in Q1 and Q2 of 2015 and converged on addressing recommendations made by MTR. The project has finalised AWP 2015 with selected and prioritised activities that can be completed by the end of December 2015 within</p>

the available project budget. However, none of the activities progressed till 30 June 2015 and no progress can be reported in this PIR.

Therefore, following text narrates the progress made by the project until the time it was active. As reported in previous year PIR, the total number of brick kilns producing REBs remains nine. Three of them were producing REB on pilot basis before the start of project. These entrepreneurs are producing both REBs and solid bricks. As on December 2011, these units have contributed to an emission reduction of 8,783 tCO₂. No further assessment has taken place since then. Please be informed that these were estimated numbers as no data was gathered until December 2011.

The project design was based on promoting Resource Efficient Bricks (REB). But it was not defined in the project document. This has led to a confusion during project implementation. Local Resource Centres (LRCs) were not given the role that was anticipated in the project document. Therefore, shortcomings were observed in the level of funding, staffing and involvement of LRCs in project management and execution.

Outcome 1: There is no evidence that the usage of resource efficient bricks has increased in public buildings during the project's implementation until December 2011. Two major hurdles in acceptance of hollow blocks and perforated bricks for public buildings are: (a) absence of comprehensive test reports by government labs on code of practice and structural stability of construction with perforated and hollow bricks, and (b) absence of up to date standards on perforated and hollow bricks, such as IS: 2222-1991 and IS: 3952-1988. In addressing these, following work was done.

- 12 cluster meetings, 2 awareness buildings were carried out, and altogether 930 people have participated in these meetings. They include brick entrepreneurs, architects, builders, government officials, central and state public works departments, BIS, Central & state urban development bodies, National Building Code, and Military Engineering Services
- A short video film "construction practices with REB's" was prepared, distributed and uploaded on the project website
- Participated in two trade shows; and
- TERI is member of BIS committee, CED-30, and proposed to consider revision of IS 2222: 1991 i.e. existing standard on "Specification for burnt clay perforated building bricks" especially with respect to requirements of perforations in the clay-fired bricks.

Outcome 2: All the brick-manufacturing units were successful in accessing bank finance – comprising working capital and/or term loans. Access to finance does not appear to be a key concern of these leading brick makers, however the quality of the DPRs are not up to the mark and they require revision and several improvements. Therefore, 5 model DPRs prepared by LRCs, 2 by TERI - Southern region, 1 by TERI Northern region, rest by other LRCs. Karnataka State Finance

Corporation has reviewed and concurred to the DPRs and in principle agreeable to provide loans.

Outcome 3: The project has done useful work in sensitizing and educating end-users. This includes preparation of background material for sensitizing end-user in the form of (a) testing of resource efficient bricks from 4 brick producers, (b) manual on better construction practices using hollow blocks. The project has reached out to around 200 builders and architects through awareness programmes and exposure visits. Many knowledge products such as approach paper, film, simulation modeling, draft manual on construction of REBs, were prepared. One international conference organized in north, one interactive meeting in south and four business-to-business meetings were organized. In all 700 people attended and benefited from these meetings. Enabling actions such as laboratory testing of REB samples were tested at accredited laboratory. The tests have provided results indicating that the REBs conform to the existing BIS standards on physical and thermal parameters except the thermal conductivity, for which, Indian laboratories are not equipped.

Outcome 4: It was learnt that the level of support provided to demonstration units is very small compared to what was described in the project document. It was a surprise to see that some of the demonstrations have started producing REBs since 2005/06, even 2001/02 in the case of Bharat Bricks, Dera Bassi. The support provided by the PFU and LRCs to the individual brick units has been far lower than what was envisaged in the project document. This would seriously question the project involvement in these demonstrations. None of the demonstration units has received a systematic technical support and monitoring and evaluation support as envisaged in the ProDoc. None of the demonstration units has been monitored for their performance, particularly energy consumption and clay use, which is crucial for the calculation of CO2 savings and establishing a case for clay and fuel savings by REBs.

Outcome 5: There may be new investments happening outside the scope of project in technology up-gradation (in particular extruders). But the project is unable to provide any solutions at this crucial juncture of brick industry. It was learnt that there are many advancements in brick manufacturing technologies in India. LRCs in North, South and East organised three cluster meetings. Three exposure visits were organized by the southern LRC to Wienerberger production unit.

Certainly, the project has not demonstrated adaptive management and found workable solutions to the problems. This project was continued business as usual scenario as it was initially designed as FSP during 2001/02. When started implementing the project, no action has been taken to address the risks and many of the risks have matured during the project implementation period to critical risk status. For example, no clarity on what is a resource efficient brick? Apparently, all the pilots selected have been operating earlier to the project start and the project support in those pilots was highly questionable.

	Based on the criteria for DO rating, the project may not achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. Therefore, the DO rating of the project is Unsatisfactory (U).
--	---

General comments on Development Objective Rating

During the reporting period, no activities were undertaken. However, several discussions and communication took place to resolve the pending audit issues and include the recommendations of MTR into the AWP 2015. Hence, no outcome-wise reporting provided.

DO Progress: Rating Definitions	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives and yield substantial global environmental benefits without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.



Implementation Progress

For each project Outcome briefly describe up to four (4) major outputs delivered this reporting period only (i.e. annual progress not cumulative progress). **Do not repeat outputs reported in previous PIRs.** If you have any general comments about the information in this section of the PIR, please note them at the bottom of this page.

Outcome	Outputs reported as of 30 June 2015
Outcome 1	Enhancing public sector awareness on resource efficient products
	In the absence of approved action plan since 1 st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity and hence no progress is reported under this outcome
Outcome 2	Access to finance for brick kiln entrepreneurs
	In the absence of approved action plan since 1 st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity and hence no progress is reported under this outcome
Outcome 3	Improved knowledge on technology including marketing
	In the absence of approved action plan since 1 st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity and hence no progress is reported under this outcome
Outcome 4	Availability of resource efficient technologies
	In the absence of approved action plan since 1 st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity and hence no progress is reported under this outcome
Outcome 5	Improved capacity of brick kiln entrepreneurs
	In the absence of approved action plan since 1 st January 2012, the project could not undertake any activity and hence no progress is reported under this outcome

General comments on Implementation Progress

During the reporting period, no activities were undertaken. However, several discussions and communication took place to resolve the pending audit issues and include the recommendations of MTR into the AWP 2015. Hence, no outcome-wise reporting provided.

Implementation Progress Rating

<p>Project Manager / Coordinator is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
<p>UNDP Country Office Programme Officer is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]

	<p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
	<p>Moderately Satisfactory</p> <p>During the reporting period, the project team from TERI addressed audit issues by agreeing to reprogramme the funds. Annual work plan was developed during the reporting period.</p> <p>AWP 2015 part 1 is for an amount of 73,32,343 USD [reprogrammed] and the main activities are as given below. All these activities will be implemented by TERI;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of working draft to BIS for inclusion of REBs • Technical note required for inclusion of REBs in bill of materials to 4 government departments in Punjab/Haryana states • Case study highlighting benefits of REBs • Finalization of handbook on construction using REBs • Present REB construction practices – a status report • Awareness to promote REBs to architects • Technical assessment of extruders • Listing existing and potential entrepreneurs to manufacturer REBs in Karnataka and Tamil Nadu <p>Part 2 of AWP will be completed in 2015-2016. It is planned for an amount of USD 217,903. The activities are [activities 1 to 4 will be implementing by TERI, 5, 6, 9 & 10 will be through UNDP procurement process and 6 & 7 planned to be done by PSCST.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete all inputs required to consider REB specifications to include in BIS Standards [IS:2222-1991] 2. Prepare procurement guidelines for inclusion of REBs for public departments 3. Prepare ‘Investment guide on REBs’ 4. Identify Financing institutions that can provide lending to REB manufacturing units 5. Conduct audit of REBs and non REBs to establish benefits 6. Assess annual production of REBs 7. Provide technical assistance to establish 3 more REBs 8. Prepare investment plans for 25 REBs

	<p>9. Prepare documentation of the project and conduct a national workshop on REBs</p> <p>10. Conduct terminal evaluation</p> <p>Though the project did not implement any activities during the reporting period, the project is making progress and looking forward to complete the project activities and aims to achieve reasonable level of targets. I provide a rating of moderately satisfactory.</p>
<p>GEF Operational Focal point is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.</p>	<p>HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
<p>Project Implementing Partner is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]
	<p>[IP rating in 2015]</p>
	<p>[comments]</p>

<p>Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).</p>	<p>5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]</p> <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
	<p>[IP rating in 2015]</p>
	<p>[comments]</p>
<p>Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps.
	<p>[IP rating in 2015]</p>
	<p>[comments]</p>
<p>UNDP Technical Adviser is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.</p>	<p>MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]

	<p>5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]</p> <p>Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Since the AWP for 2012, 2013, and 2014 has not been signed, there are no activities implemented during this reporting period. Although the discussions were advanced in 2015, no activities were conducted during Q1 and Q2 of 2015.</p> <p>Therefore, no question of annual targets, update of risk log in ATLAS, and financial delivery.</p> <p>The project supervision and monitoring is not in place during last reporting period and no PSC meetings were conducted during last reporting period. The project has not demonstrated adaptive management. Therefore, based on the criteria for IP rating, the project implementation progress can be rated Unsatisfactory (U).</p>

General comments on Implementation Progress Rating

--

Implementation Progress: Ratings Definitions	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Adjustments

Project Planning

If delays have occurred in reaching key projects milestones - the inception workshop, the Mid-term Review and/or the Terminal Evaluation - then note below the current status of that milestone, the original planned and actual/expected dates, and comments to explain the reasons for the delays and their implications.

Key Project Milestone	Status (pick one option below)	Original Planned Date	Actual/Expected Date	Comments including reasons for delays and their implications
Inception Workshop	completed	May 2008	November 2009	As per prodoc, the project should have started in April 2008. However, the project was actually initiated from 8 October 2009 (date of receipt of first payment)
Mid-term Review	completed	May 2010	February 2012	-
Terminal Evaluation	delayed	April 2012	November 2015	Audit and MTR made serious observations as already explained in the earlier sections. The project was kept on hold till these are resolved/ addressed. However, now Annual Work Plan is prepared and project is set to move forward and complete the activities by 2016. Accordingly the schedule for terminal evaluation is adjusted.

Critical Risk Management

Select from below the critical risks only that appear in the ATLAS project risk log and briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk. Please ensure that any 'social' risks identified during the environmental and social screening of the project are reflected in the ATLAS risk log under type/description 'other'. Note that the total number of critical risks is used to calculate the overall risk rating of the project. The methodology to determine the overall risk rating is explained further on this page.

Current/Active Critical Risks (pick one option below; add rows as necessary)	Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2015
Risk: Excess charging by Responsible Party [Financial]	The RP was asked to reprogramme and refund the excess charges. The RP has agreed to reprogramme. Accordingly AWP 2015, part 1 has been developed. Once the MoEFCC and UNDP signs AWP, the reprogrammed activities will be implemented.
Risk: Gap in linkages made between PMU and stakeholders [Strategic]	The project was on hold for last two years pending resolving audit observations and addressing recommendations of MTR. The PMU was not touch with stakeholders, missing the rapport built. However, AWP 2015 is developed and focuses revival of linkages in 2 regions instead of five regions as per original LFA.

[Environmental, Financial, Operational, Organizational, Political, Regulatory, Strategic, Other]

General comments on Adjustments

N.A.



Communicating Impact

All projects must complete this section.

Tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's lives.

Please use 500 words or less.

Avoid UN jargon, acronyms, and technical terms. Use plain language.

Include quotes from beneficiaries, if possible, and be sure to provide their names

The following questions can be used as guidance for your story:

What is this project about – the issue, interventions, and impacts?

Who are the beneficiaries of this project?

How have project interventions improved people's livelihoods?

What was the most notable achievement during this reporting period?

This text will be used for UNDP corporate communications, the UNDP-GEF website, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts.

The project aims to promote energy efficiency in brick making. The project from inception focused on promoting resource efficient bricks (REB). REBs are perforated bricks. The energy consumption and the soil requirement is about 20% less than the solid bricks of the same size. Thus introduction of REBs is win-win from the point of two kinds of resource reduction, both energy and soil. Quite often, fertile top soil is used as raw material in brick making, any reduction of this raw material is valuable for agriculture sustainability.

The project aimed at bringing REB use in large scale in public sector and private sector. It was essential that the REB use is included in procurement guidelines for the public sector to make purchase of REBs. For this REB inclusion in Bureau of Indian Standards was helpful. Hence, the project has initiated actions to get REBs included in the procurement guidelines of public sector and BIS. Project has proposed to BIS to consider revision of IS 2222: 1991(existing standard on "Specification for burnt clay perforated building bricks" especially with respect to requirements of perforations in the clay-fired bricks). REBs were tested in accredited laboratories on the parameters of compressive strength, etc. 14 cluster level meetings, awareness programmes were conducted to enhance public awareness on REBs were nearly 1000 people participated. They include brick entrepreneurs, architects, builders, government officials, central & state public works departments, Bureau of Indian Standard, Central & state urban development bodies, National Building Code, and Military Engineering Services.

Five Local Resource Centres (LRC) were identified to support the field level implementation in five different regions of the country. They were expected to help the project in conducting awareness/cluster workshops, provide technical assistance to brick entrepreneurs to integrate REB production, market development, etc. To increase lending to REB manufacturing, sensitization of Financing Institutions was conducted and model Detailed Project Reports were developed and shared with FIs. Karnataka State Finance Corporation has considered the REB DPR and concurred to lend the proposals on REBs. International linkages were increased by getting the international suppliers to interact with potential REB entrepreneurs in India. To help the those potential REB entrepreneurs firm up their decisions, exposure visits to already established REBs was also carried out.

Project has also provided technical assistance to demonstrated technology to produce REBs. Nine REB manufacturing units have been supported under the projects which have produced about 9.6 million bricks in two years, 2010 & 12. This energy reduced by these REBs is equivalent to reduction of 8,783 tCO₂.

What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period?

The most significant change could be positive or negative and could relate to any aspect of the project such as direct beneficiaries, communities, partnerships, policy. The purpose of this section is to capture lessons learned and changes that many not be revealed through the project's logical framework or other parts of the PIR.
This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region.
The project was on hold during the reporting period to resolve the audit issues and address MTR. However, during the reporting period, most significantly, Responsible party has agreed to reprogramme the amount that otherwise to be refunded to UNDP. Discussions were held between RP, Ministry, UNDP to consider the relevant recommendations of MTR and Annual Work Plan 2015 was prepared for firstly reprogrammed amount and other balance amount.

Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting period.

Describe the main focus of the efforts. What is the evidence that the initiative(s) contributed to results?
This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region.
Nothing to report during the reporting period.

Project links & social media

Please list below the website addresses (URLs) that exist for this project, including any links to social media sites. Please include: Project website, Project page on the UNDP website, Adaptation Learning Mechanism (UNDP-ALM) platform, Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, Google +	Nothing to report
Please share hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside, external source.	Nothing to report
Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents.	Nothing to report

General comments on Communicating Impact

--



Partnerships

All projects must complete this section. Please enter "N/A" in cells that are not applicable to your project.

This information is used to get a better understanding of the work GEF-funded projects are doing with key partners, including the GEF Small Grants Programme, indigenous peoples, the private sector, and other partners. The data may be used for reporting to GEF Secretariat, the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP Corporate Communications, posted on the UNDP-GEF website, and for other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. The RTA should view and edit/elaborate on the information entered here.

Partners	Describe innovative aspects of the project in working with (limit = 2000 characters for each section)
Civil Society Organisations/NGOs	N/A
Indigenous Peoples	N/A
Private Sector	N/A
GEF Small Grants Programme	N/A
Other Partners	N/A

General comments on Partnerships

N/A

Gender

All projects must complete this section.

This information is used in the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP-GEF Annual Gender Report, reporting to the UNDP Gender Steering and Implementation Committee and for other internal and external communications and learning.

Has a gender or social assessment been carried out this reporting period?	Nothing to report during reporting period
If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what were the findings?	No
Does this project specifically target woman or girls as key stakeholders?	No
<p>Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women.</p> <p>Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme).</p>	Nothing to report
Please upload the gender or social needs assessment and any other documents related to the project's gender-related results.	N/A

General comments on Gender

N/A

Environmental or Social Grievance

This section must be completed by the UNDP Country Office if a grievance related to the environmental or social impacts of this project was addressed this reporting period.

It is very important that the questions are answered fully and in detail.

If no environmental or social grievance was addressed this reporting period then please do not answer the following questions.

If more than one grievance was addressed, please answer the following questions for the most significant grievance only and explain the other grievance(s) in the comment box below.

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?	Nothing to report in this reporting period [Environmental/Financial/Organisational/Political/ Operational/Regulatory/Strategic/Other]
What is the current status of the grievance?	Nothing to report [Resolved / On-going / Both]
How would you rate the significance of the grievance?	Nothing to report [Minor / Significant / Serious]
Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here.	Nothing to report

Rating	Description
Minor	The grievance had/has a low impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project.
Significant	The grievance had/is having a significant impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project, but the project is still expected to achieve its objective.
Serious	The grievance had/is having a serious impact on the day-to-day implementation of the project, and there is a risk (50% or higher) that the project may not be able to achieve its objective.