

# Annex 3: PIR Generic Offline Template

**Generic Offline Template – 2014 PIR**

**THIS TEMPLATE CANNOT BE USED TO SUBMIT THE FINAL 2014 PIR, THE FINAL PIR CAN ONLY BE SUBMITTED ONLINE.**

**This MS Word file contains all questions and sections of the 2014 PIR. Unlike the** *2014 PIR Word Report***, this file contains no project-specific information.**

**Please note:**

**> This file can be used to prepare PIR input offline, if that approach is found to be helpful. The use of this file is entirely optional.**

**> Any information entered into this file must be manually transferred into the online PIR system.**

**> This generic offline template does not in any way replace the mandatory online 2014 PIR; a completed version of this offline template WILL NOT be accepted as any project’s final PIR, will not be transferred to the GEF, and the project will be in non-compliance with the GEF mandatory reporting requirements.**

**The final PIR can only be accepted through the online PIR system.**

**Basic Data / Basic Project & Finance Data**

***Basic Project Information***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PIMS ID** | 3214 |
| **Project Title** | Sustainable Urban Transport Program |

***Project Contact Information***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
| **National Project Director** | Mr. C.K Khaitan | [ck.khaitan@nic.in](mailto:ck.khaitan@nic.in) |
| **National Project Manager** | Mr. I. C. Sharma | [iutindia.sutp@gmail.com](mailto:iutindia.sutp@gmail.com) |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Ms. Preeti Soni | [preeti.soni@undp.org](mailto:preeti.soni@undp.org) |
| **GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP)** | Mr Shashi Shekhar-GEF OFP | [shashi.shekhar@nic.in](mailto:shashi.shekhar@nic.in) |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | Ministry of Urban Development (MOUD), Government of India | |
| **Other Partners** | World Bank | |

***Finance***

[Will be automatically uploaded to each PIR by end June. No input required. Data to be uploaded: GEF Grant Amount; PPG Amount; Total GEF Grant; Co-financing; Total GEF Grant Disbursement as of 30 June]

***Project Milestones and Timeframe***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Revised planned closing date** | December 2014 |

***Project Supervision***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2013 to 1 July 2014)** |  | 1. 11-Oct-2013- Project  Standing Committee Meeting 2. 20-Nov-2013-Project Standing Committee Meeting 3. 25- Nov-2013-Project Steering Committee Meeting 4. 17-April-2014-Project Standing Committee Meeting 5. 25-April-2014-Project Steering Committee Meeting |

***Terminal PIR***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report?** | No |

***General Comments on Basic Data***

|  |
| --- |
| Please insert any comments to the finance data here. |
|  |

**Development Objective Progress / Progress Toward Development Objectives**

| **Outcome No** | **Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2014** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Project Development Objective and Global Environment Objective: to promote environmentally sustainable urban transport in India and to improve the usage of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities. | The number of cities that develop an identifiable urban transport planning process (i.e., managed by professional units/institutions of government, following certain procedures and guidance, and involving various level of analytical work and stakeholders’ participation) increases, by project end. | None of the project cities has an urban transport planning process | All project cities have an identifiable urban transport planning process in place | The project through the world bank component is working in 5 cities on urban transport planning process   * Indore, Madhya Pradesh * Mysore, Karnataka * Hubli-Dharwad, Karnataka * Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh * Pimpri-Chinchwad, Maharashtra   The world bank component has been extended till May 2016 to realize this objective. |
| IUT provides technical assistance to a number of states in implementing various provisions of National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) | N/A | 7 sites | MoUs signed with the following:   * Uttarakhand (UTC) * Bihar (BUDICO) * Bhopal (BCLL), * Ghaziabad (GDA), * Chandigarh Administration |
| IUT provides training and advisory services to a number of project cities (5 nos), and non-project cities (5 nos) in implementing various provisions of NUTP. | N/A | 10 cities (5 project and 5 non-project cities) | MoU signed with two states (for whole state) and one city.   * Bihar * Uttrakhand * Bhopal |
| Outcome No 1 | Institute of Urban Transport strengthened to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy | Business Plan developed  to strengthen IUT | NA | Business Plan developed, implemented to strengthen IUT | Business Plan for strengthening of IUT has been developed through Consultancy support and is currently being implemented at IUT.  Following personnel continue to serve IUT as part of the business plan :   * 1 senior training coordinator * 1 junior training coordinator * 1 training assistance * 1 research development officer * 1 research assistant * 1 information cum library officer * 1 publication head * 1 publication assistant * 1 accounts manager * 2 software engineers * 1 clerical assistant |
|  | Certification of IUT to serve  as accreditation body  on Sustainable Urban Transport | 0 | 1 | Related request was submitted to the Ministry for approval and has been rejected |
|  | Knowledge Management  Data Centre (KMC)  operational at IUT | NA | KMC Operational by end of 2015 | KMC RFP floated by UNDP for the 2nd time and bids received are under evaluation. |
|  | IUT’s knowledge management database is established and operational | 0 | 1 | KMC RFP floated by UNDP and received bids are under evaluation |
|  | Trial validity data of cities entered into KMC | 0 | 46 | 0 |
|  | Validation of SLB cities data into KMC | 0 | 12 | 0 |
|  | Policy research conducted by IUT for MoUD | 0 | 6 | The following research has been conducted:   * Review of UMTAs in India * Best Practices in Urban Transport, India * Study to Improve and Upgrade IPT in India * Sustainable Urban transport in India |
|  | Memorandum of Understanding  (MoU) signed with  International institutions to  build knowledge and expertise of IUT to sustain the capacity building  activities after SUTP project ends | 0 | 3 | * MoUs signed with   JapanTransportation Planning Association (JTPA)   * LTA signed with Singapore Institute for Transportation and Development policy |
|  | IUT appraised Comprehensive Mobility Plan (CMP) for cities are approved by MOUD under JnNURM | 0 | 65 | Completed |
|  | Institutionalizing corpus support for operation of IUT’s business plan by MoUD | NA | MOUD provides one time financial corpus to IUT to maintain the required human and financial resources to function as Technical expert on Urban Transport. |  |
|  | IUT signs Memorandum of Understanding with states to provide technical support and advisory services on urban transport. | 0 | 7 | MoUs signed with the following:   * Uttarakhand (UTC) * Bihar (BUDICO) * Bhopal (BCLL), * Ghaziabad (GDA), * Chandigarh Administration |
|  | Preparation of Service Level Benchmark (SLB) for cities by IUT | 0 | 15 | SLB study completed for 6 cities:   * Delhi * Jaipur * Patna * Jammu * Nanded * Vijayawada |
|  | Number of DPR evaluations carried out by IUT for MoUD on all technical aspects of urban transport. | 0 | 65 | Completed |
|  | | | | | |
| Outcome No 2 | Government officials, urban planners, practitioners receive training on various aspects of sustainable urban transport. | Number of master trainers trained on various topics of sustainable urban transport | 0 | 100 | 34 |
|  | Number of training programmes conducted for Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops | 0 | 5 | 2 |
|  | Number of trainings by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 40 | 12 |
|  | Training provided by IUT on thematic areas for transport sector professionals | 0 | 5 thematic trainings  2 topical trainings | * 4 thematic training * 2 topical – ITS & Rail transit) |
|  | Number of people trained by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 1000 | 700 |
|  | | | | | |
| Outcome No 3 | Manuals, Toolkits and Standard prepared  to serve as reference documents, guides  to develop and implement of sustainable urban transport. | Sustainable urban transport training manuals developed by IUT | 0 | 10 | Consortium of EMBARQ, UMTC & GIZ have prepared modules on 10 topics and submitted to IUT and the same modules were disseminated for use by Government officials, policy makers, urban transport planners and practitioners after providing them step by step guidance for planning and implementation of  Urban Transport solutions. |
|  | Toolkits developed by IUT | 0 | 15 | Centres of Excellence of Ministry of Urban Development and other selected institutes are preparing toolkits on 15 topics out of which  11 toolkits have been prepared by various centers of excellence. The remaining 4 are under preparation. |
|  | Number of validation workshops conducted by IUT to test the developed training manuals and toolkits | 0 | 15 | 12 |
|  | | | | | |
| Outcome No 4 | Increased awareness of Sustainable Urban Transport interventions among city government officials and transport sector professionals. | Quarterly newsletters published and circulated by the PMU | 0 | 20 | 12th Edition of the newsletter has been published and is being distributed to transport professionals, Junior and Senior officials from various ministries and state governments ,academicians and students |
|  |  | Number of press releases and brochures about the project disseminated | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  | SUTP web portal developed, launched and periodically updated by PMU | 0 | 1 | The website is being regularly updated.  Cumulative hits received for SUTP website are 25429. |
|  |  | IUT organizes one annual international conference | 0 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | Experience and knowledge sharing workshop for cities and state governments organized by PMU | 0 | 3 | 3 |

**Development Objectives Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** is the person managing the day to day operations of the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.  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:   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?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   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. |
| Satisfactory |
| The project is moving ahead towards accomplishing its developing objectives and is expected to attain its major global environment objectives by Dec 2015.   * As far as IUT strengthening is concerned, the business plan to strengthen IUT is currently being implemented and the recommended number of Human Resources are already in place and serving IUT as part of the business plan. * The procurement of agency to set up the Knowledge Management Center is under process and setting up of KMC is expected to start in August 2014. * All the 10 modules and toolkits have been successfully prepared by various center of excellences. The 10 Modules have been developed with learning objectives to understand the growing problems of urban transport, the key issues involved and solutions required. All 10 toolkits have been prepared and disseminated for use by urban transport planners after providing them step by step guidance for planning and implementation of Urban Transport solutions. * To fill the gaps and match the growing need of the Urban Transport professional on few areas, the standing committee has approved preparation of 5 additional toolkits which is expected to be completed by the end of this year. * The capacity building of city officials is being carried out successfully as per planned schedule. * Dissemination activities such as the SUTP website, quarterly newsletters, and various experience sharing workshops have been undertaken as per the annual plans.   The procurement of agency to set up the KMC has been an issue from past 2 years. UNDP has managed this well in consultation with IUT and MoUD and recruitment of an agency is underway with revised the Terms of Reference focusing only critical aspects of Knowledge Management Center.  The unavailability of suitable master trainers for training transport professionals has been a concern which has slightly delayed the training of trainer’s activity. PMU in consultation with MoUD and IUT has outreached number of master trainers across India and mobilizing them to be part of the project. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  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:   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?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   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. |
| Satisfactory |
| The project is overall on track demonstrating in accordance with the development objectives. The Project is helping cities, professionals, government agencies achieve their sustainable transport goals, through building institutional knowledge and dissemination of information on best practices, training and capacity building. The project through its activities has so far built government capacity to plan and implement climate friendly and sustainable urban transport interventions at national, state and city levels.  The project in nutshell has   * Helped city planners, state and national officials and decision-makers understand the importance of environmentally sustainable urban transport in today’s context. * Provided guidelines for the development of comprehensive plans for improved and sustainable mobility in Indian cities. * Provided a modern state-of-the-practice methodology and toolkit to formulate and evaluate particular investment projects. * Developed competence amongst functionaries in the concerned departments and agencies of the central and State governments for improved formulation and evaluation of urban transport plans and projects.   The 10 subject modules on; Sensitization, Institutional development, Financing and cost benefit analysis/ Fare fixation, Demand Assessment, Urban Transport Planning, Integrated Planning of Infrastructure, Public transport Modal Integration, Environment Issues, Contracting, and Operations & Traffic Management are being used by master trainers to train transport planners on sustainable transport planning practices.  The 11 toolkits developed by the project on; Land use Transport Integration, ITS for Traffic Management, Road Safety & Safety Audits, Demand Management, Finance and Financial Analysis, Urban Traffic System Design Evaluation, Environmental Analysis, Transport Demand Management, Public Transport Accessibility, Urban Road Capacity and Level of Service, and Social Impact Assessment are being used by transport planners to plan sustainable transportation.  The project has provided necessary support in terms of capacity to IUT in carrying out the appraisal of reports on urban transport under JnNURM and for projects funded by MoUD. These include proposals for bus funding projects, City Mobility Plans (CMP), Bus Rapid Transit System (BRTS), City Traffic and Transportation Study (CTTS), Non-Motorised Transport (NMT), metro rail etc. In addition several technical documents are sent by the Ministry for comments.  There are no specific risks which would negatively impact the overall objective of the project. However, some operational risks have been outlined in the next section. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point. | HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  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:   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?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   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 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **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). | RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.  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:   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?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   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. |
| Satisfactory |
| The project is successfully helping towards strengthening Institute of Urban Transport and providing orientation for transport planners and policy makers who wish to promote sustainable urban mobility in their cities. Through capacity building exercises it is helping transport planners understand various sustainable options for Indian context to make its transportation systems more sustainable, efficient and safe.  The business plan project has developed for IUT is helping the institution in assessing challenges and opportunities associated with urban transport. The project has developed guidelines that includes toolkits for transport related planning and monitoring which will serve as a standardized framework to conduct a quantitative evaluation of the existing systems and accordingly plan for new systems. The capacity building programme is creating a pool of skilled manpower to be available in the country for recruitment by cities/states for planning sustainable transportation. The capacity building activities is helping to focus on the service improvements to achieve economic, efficient, socially equitable, and low carbon mobility. This will fill the existing gap and provide clear guidelines to achieve a well-integrated transport system.  The other component of this project is making information on urban transport available to various stakeholders. This is proposed to be undertaken through the development of a web-based Knowledge Portal and “Knowledge Management Centre”. The project is producing quarterly publication of newsletters and a half-yearly technical journal, and holding annual conferences to sensitize people associated with transport planning.  Since technologies and infrastructure requirements are changing very fast, the project needs to align itself through updation of information and resource materials. In the coming months the project should review the use of resource materials developed during the course of the project by the transport planners and incorporate changes if required based on the need. |
| **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). | RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.  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:   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?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   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 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.  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:   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?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   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. |
| [DO rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |

***General comments on Development Objective Rating***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 2014** |
| **Outcome 1** | **Institute of Urban Transport strengthened to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy**   1. The business plan is being implemented at IUT. The manpower suggested have been recruited and are serving IUT as part of the business plan 2. Activities carried out by IUT under various categories during the reporting period are listed below:- 3. Policy research conducted/started by IUT for MoUD during the period (July 13-June 14)    * Research Study on Service Level Benchmark    * Review of National Urban Transport Policy, 2006    * Review of best Practices in Urban Transport    * Review of UMTA Status 4. Partnerships formed with other professional transport organizations and academia to carry out research activities MoUD during the period (July 13-June 14)    * JTPA    * ITDP 5. Names of cities for which CMPs have been appraised by IUT and subsequently approved by MoUD during the period (July 13-June 14)    * CMP Ludhiana, Final report 6. Names of States with which MoU has been signed by IUT for providing technical support during the period (July 13-June 14)    * Uttarakhand State Urban Development    * Bihar- BUIDCo 7. Names of cities for which SLBs have been prepared during the period (July 13-June 14)    * Delhi    * Jaipur    * Jammu-Katra    * Nanded    * Patna    * Vijayawada 8. Number of DPR evaluated by IUT for MoUD    * DPR – 158    * Bus funding reports – 41   In addition during a meeting held on 03-April-2014, under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (UT) MoUD, it was decided that as the Business Plan was prepared in the year 2011, there is a need to update the same. JS (UT) conveyed that M/s Deloitte may be approached to update the Business Plan without any financial effect.   1. The KMC RFP after revision and approval of the standing committee members was re-floated by UNDP. The bid evaluation is under process. 2. 4 Quarterly newsletter on Urban Transport issues have been published by IUT and regarding research projects, the subject areas are being defined as part of NUTReP report, which is under finalization. Once approved the research projects would be taken up by IUT. |
| **Outcome 2** | **Government officials, urban planners, practitioners receive training on various aspects of sustainable urban transport.**   1. 544 city officials have been trained during the city level capacity building of transport officials held across 9 different cities in India 2. 126 transport officials have been trained on Toolkits under 14 national level workshops on toolkits held during the reporting period. |
| **Outcome 3** | **Manuals, Toolkits and Standard prepared to serve as reference documents, guides to develop and implement of sustainable urban transport**   1. During the last reporting period 10 Modules and 10 Toolkits have been successfully prepared. In addition during the current reporting period, 5 additional toolkits have been approved by the standing committee members out of which 2 have been completed and the remaining 3 are under preparation. The status of the 5 additional toolkits are as follows:  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SI No | Tool Kit Name | Consultant Responsible | Status | | 1 | **Revision of CMP Guidelines** | **IUT** | **Submitted** | | 2 | **Urban freight management** | **SPA** | **Under Preparation** | | 3 | **ITS for public transport and BRTS** | **CEPT** | **Under Preparation** | | 4 | **City transport network** | **IUT** | **Under Preparation** | | 5 | **Urban Mobility Laws** | **UMTC** | **Submitted** |      1. For the purpose of dissemination of toolkits prepared under the GEF grants and for those prepared earlier under various grants on subjects related to Sustainable Urban Transport, 19 documents have been prepared and grouped under 4 thematic topics namely – mass rapid transit, bus/ BRT services, Planning and Traffic Management. 2. To ensure that all the toolkits look similar design and look a layout designer was hired and work has been initiated. Till date 10 reports have been completed by the layout designer. A compendium of toolkits and subject modules as approved by the standing committee are being prepared by experts hired by IUT. 3. Two workshops for validation of toolkits on social impact assessment and R & R plan for   urban transport projects and urban road traffic systems was held from 26th to 27th August 2013  , at Goa where the 2 toolkits were covered in detail by SPA and NIT Warangal. A total of  30 participants attended the workshop.  The first National workshops on Mass Rapid Transit was held in Delhi for 3 days from  11th - 13th November, 2013. A total of 25 officials participated in the national workshop.  The Second National workshop on Bus/BRT services was held in Delhi for 3 days from  6th -8th January, 2014. A total of 26 officials participated in the national workshop.  The Third National workshops on planning module was held for 3 days from 10th –  12th March, 2014. A total of 24 officials participated in the national workshop. The fourth  National workshops on planning was organized for 3 days from 28th - 30thMay, 2014.  A total of 21 officials participated in the national workshop |
| **Outcome 4** | **Increased awareness of Sustainable Urban Transport interventions among city government officials and transport sector professionals.**   1. Two issues of GEF-SUTP Quarterly Newsletter were published and circulated to all stakeholders. The newsletters are also available on the SUTP website. 2. The SUTP Website is being regularly maintained and updated. Cumulative number of visitors to SUTP website has reached 25443. 3. SUTP Stall was setup at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 3-6 December, 2013 which helped to aware /apprise the visitors to the stall regarding the SUTP project and its various components. |

***General comments on Implementation Progress***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Implementation Progress Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** is the person managing the day to day operations of the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.   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]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   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. |
| Satisfactory |
| The output reported in this report, clearly signifies adequate progress towards achievement of the project outcomes. For instance by taking the business plan as a framework of capacity development considerable improvement have taken place at IUT which indicates both Institutional and Individual capacities at IUT at a relatively improved level.  In addition; to further fine tune the impact of the capacity at IUT, a necessary step towards revising the business plan is in process which denotes that capacity development at IUT will be a continuous process. It is expected that establishment of a full-fledged KMC at IUT by next year would further inject impetus in improving the technical decision taking capacities at IUT. Hence the inclusion of the KMC consultant for developing the KMC during the coming months would play a key role in achieving the outcomes of the project.  The development of Training Modules and Toolkits have been a great success which have been widely disseminated among transport professionals working in the Urban Transport sector. In addition, 5 more toolkits are expected to be completed this end of the current year which would further build cognizance of urban transport professionals in planning and implementing Urban Transport solutions. The capacity building programme at city level have been accomplished as per the annual training plans. In addition 14 national level workshops on Toolkits have been successfully conducted during the reporting period wherein the response of the participants have been extremely encouraging.  The PMU team has been actively involved in widening the horizons of the SUTP project through various Project Outreach and Dissemination activities. The SUTP website is being regularly updated with additional information pertaining to the SUTP project. The Quarterly Newsletter published by the PMU has helped to raise awareness on Urban Transport issues as well as reporting the progress of the project (12 Newsletters has been published till date). In addition a SUTP Stall was set up at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo 2013.  Barring the expenditure related to the procurement of the KMC consultant all other project related expenditures have been in line with the planned budget for the year. However it is expected that once the KMC consultant is on board during the coming months, the overall expenditure would experience a lift. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.   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]   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.   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. |
| Satisfactory |
| **Delivery of outputs:** Out of the four outputs the project has been successful in delivering the three outputs (1. Individual Capacity Development, 2. Preparation of Manuals and Toolkits 3. Awareness raising and dissemination) whereas the project has faced numerous challenges in creating impact through the fourth output which is on strengthening capacity of IUT. This has been mainly because the Knowledge Management Centre which was envisaged as a learning repository including a data base, which can be effectively utilized by all the stakeholders working in the domain of Urban Transport could not start on time. Also, the business plan which was developed for IUT to identify the capacity building requirements in the year 2011 needs to be updated based on the technological and infrastructural changes in the Indian Urban transport domain. However, these marginal issues has not impacted the overall objective of the project and it is expected that the knowledge management center will be setup by end of this year and will start serving as a one stop shop on transport related information for transport planners and decision makers. Overall, the delivery of outputs has been satisfactory and the project would catch up operational delays in the coming months.  **Risk management:** The project has successfully mitigated all risks. The risks arising due to two unsuccessful attempts to setup knowledge management center has been mitigated by providing documents/ toolkits/ research papers on IUT and SUTP website. Initial lack of interest of the trainers to attend training of trainers has been mitigated through extensive outreach activities and mobilizing the trainers from all parts of India by PMU and MouD. The PMU in consultation with Ministry of Urban Development has been quite active in taking decisions and mitigating risks in advance.  One of the critical risks realized during this year of the project is surplus budget of USD 1.5m which might remain unutilized even if all the activities proposed in the prodoc are completed by end of next year. The reporting of project activities by the then Programme Officer was not accurate and did not reflect this gap. Proper reporting may have enabled us to take corrective budget revision early on in the project  **Adaptive management:** In line with changing needs the project has shown many examples of adaptive management especially taking into account the changing needs due to technological and infrastructural changes in the transport sector during the project implementation. New toolkits were developed on recommendation of transport planners, existing toolkits developed by other agencies in the past were updated to upgrade the transport related information in changing context.  **Monitoring and evaluation:** During the year, overall monitoring of the project was done very closely in consultation with MoUD. Series of meetings were organized with the Joint Secretary and Secretary (MoUD) to assess the project progress and resolve issues. The Ministry has put in considerable time and encouraged to modify the sub-activities as per the changing needs in the transport sector without compromising the objectives of the project.  Overall, this was a successful year for the project with satisfactory delivery. Issues were dealt in a much proficient way learning from past experiences. However, delay in project activities should be covered in the coming months once the consultants are on board. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point. | HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.   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]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **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). | RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.   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]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **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). | RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.   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]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.   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]   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.   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. |
| [IP rating in 2014] |
| [comments] |

***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 |
| **Project Start (i.e. project document signature date)** | on schedule | April, 2010 | April, 2010 | No delay |
| **Inception Workshop** | on schedule | June 9, 2010 | June 9, 2010 | No delay |
| **Mid-term Review** | Delayed but completed | March 2012 | June 2013 | Due to a delay in the implementation of most of the project activities, the MTR was conducted in June 2013 against March 2012 (as per approved CEO endorsement request document). This will have an influence on the Terminal Evaluation and Project closure date accordingly. |
| **Terminal Evaluation** | delayed | Jan 2015 | Jan 2016 | Delay in the implementation of most of the project activities. Project closure date needs to be revised |
| **Project Duration (i.e. project extension)** | Extended | Dec 2014 | June 2016 | 1. It is foreseen that establishment of KMDC will take longer than expected. Training initiatives will also benefit from time extension. The revised project closure date is June 2016. 2. In addition during the 17th Steering Committee held on 25th April 2014, Secretary UD (chairman of Steering Committee) had advised to keep a buffer period of six months and as a consequence the Steering committee approved continuance of the PMU up to May 2016 3. Further, as per the funding pattern, the expenditure of the Project Management Unit, SUTP is being supported by both UNDP and Government of India funds. Hence continued support of UNDP to the PMU till the completion of the project period is indispensable for the successful completion of the SUTP in general. |

***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 2014** |
| Training of Trainers (Strategic) | Since not many professionals are available as trainers for transport related issues, retaining the developed knowledge pool will be difficult. There should be an approach to build the pool of trained trainers under the project. |
| Procurement of services under the project (Operational) | The procurement of consultancy services for setting up the knowledge management center under the SUTP got delayed. Since this activity has tight timeline of 1 year for its completion and in case of any further delay, project closure date will be impacted. |
| Strengthening the capacity of IUT as per business plan (Financial) | MoUD was supposed to provide the required finance for the corpus, which is still pending. |
| Project budget and expenditure | Surplus budget of USD 1.5m might remain unutilized even if all the activities proposed in the prodoc are completed by end of next year. The reporting of project activities by the then Programme Officer was not accurate and did not reflect this gap. Proper reporting may have enabled us to take corrective budget revision early on in the project |

***General comments on Adjustments***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Evaluations**

***Mid-term Review (MTR)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Has a Mid-term Review report for this project been completed since the last PIR was submitted? | | Yes |
| Will this project undertake a mid-term review? | | Yes |
| Will the mid-term report be completed and translated into English by December of this year? | | Yes |
| **Actual Co-financing at Mid-term**(Answer these questions only if the MTR was completed this reporting period)  NA | | |
| How much of the total planned co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? | | US$ |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. (word limit = 200 words) |  | |
| For projects that completed an MTR since the last PIR was submitted, please respond to the following (500 words or less):   * Briefly outline the key findings and recommendations of the MTR report and the management response. * Discuss any problems/issues with the final MTR report or the MTR process. * Discuss any problems/issues with the related GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool. |  | |

***Terminal Evaluation (TE)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Has a Terminal Evaluation report for this project been completed since the last PIR was submitted? | | No |
| If the TE report has been completed, has it been uploaded to the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre](file:///C:/Users/ciara.daniels/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/U20SVW6P/erc.undp.org)? | | No |
| **Actual Co-financing at Project End**(Answer these questions only if the TE was completed this reporting period)  NA | | |
| How much of the total planned co-financing as committed in the Project Document has *actually been realized*? | | US$ |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. (word limit = 200 words) | NA | |
| For projects that completed a TE since the last PIR was submitted, please respond to the following (500 words or less):   * Briefly outline the key findings and recommendations of the TE report and the management response. * Discuss any problems/issues with the final TE report or the TE process. * Discuss any problems/issues with the related GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool. | NA | |

**Communications & KM**

***Tell us the story of your project, focusing on the impacts and results achieved during this reporting period.***

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |
| ***About the project about – the issue, interventions, and impacts?***  The objective of this Project is to reduce the growth trajectory of GHG emissions from the transport sector in India through the promotion of environmentally sustainable urban transport, strengthening government capacity to plan, finance, implement, operate and manage climate friendly and sustainable urban transport interventions at national, state and city levels, and increasing the modal share of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities.  **Notable achievements:**   * Implementation of some recommendations of the Business plan has resulted in development of both Institutional and Individual capacities at IUT. * The development of Training Modules and Toolkits have been a great success which have been widely disseminated among transport professionals working in the Urban Transport sector. In addition, 5 more toolkits are expected to be completed by end of the current year which would further build cognizance of urban transport professionals in planning and implementing Urban Transport solutions. * The capacity building programme at city level have been accomplished as per the annual training plans wherein 544 city transport officials from various cities of the country have been trained in 9 different locations * In addition 14 national level workshops on Toolkits have been successfully conducted during the reporting period wherein the response of the participants have been extremely encouraging. A total of 126 officials participated in the workshops. * The Quarterly Newsletter published by the PMU has helped to raise awareness on Urban Transport issues as well as reporting the progress of the project (12 Newsletters has been published till date).   **The beneficiaries have found the project very useful and so have given encouraging feedback**   1. “I am looking after the transport projects in Delhi – Metro, BRT and other transport projects. This is my first time in a toolkits training workshop and I have much benefitted from it.”( Mr KK Satija, Assistant Director, Transport Department, Government of Delhi) 2. “We are running about 3500 buses in Chennai. I have really enjoyed the session and believe that it will be useful in taking our work forward in Chennai.”( Mr Ganeshan, Metro Transport Corporation, Chennai ) 3. “We have a few projects in Ludhiana and Amritsar. This workshop has been helpful because we have learnt about new concepts in urban transport, which would help us understand better and plan well. Hopefully by implementing these new concepts we will save unnecessary costs as well. (Mr Pradeep Reddy, Punjab Infrastructure Development Board) 4. “The capacity building workshops and study tours in India and abroad under SUTP gave us exposure and the logic behind the requirement of Intelligent Transport Management System: Why it is required, how it operates etc. Through SUTP, we visited cities like Ahmadabad, where we saw how useful ITS is for public transport. (Mr Shrikant Shriniwas Savane, Executive Engineer, PCMC |

***Adaptive management this reporting period.***

|  |
| --- |
| Describe a problem that was encountered and how the project team overcame that problem. Give multiple examples if possible.  This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region. |
| The project has very well addressed the growing need of new information on technologies, best practices, frameworks etc. As a result, the project has developed additional toolkits on new information based on the demand and feasibility in Indian context. This is something which was not envisaged at the beginning of the project but evolved over time.  In order to provide more comprehensive information, the scope of Knowledge Management Center was expanded to include data from 34 cities which was earlier confined to only data from 3 cities and hence it is expected that the KMC would benefit more cities in future to access useful data and information and help Government, Business, Consultants, Academia, Citizens, Policy makers, Industry, Consultancy & Research community in taking appropriate transport related decisions across the cities.  In addition during a meeting held on 03-April-2014, under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (UT) MoUD, it was decided that as the Business Plan was prepared in the year 2011, there is a need to update the same to adapt to the existing status of IUT’s capacity. |

***Lessons learned***

|  |
| --- |
| Describe lessons learned in the course of the project's implementation relating to any aspect of the project - technical, social, political, administrative, etc.  This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region. |
| ***Technical***   * The Logical Framework and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework has helped in further defining the project outcomes and with suitable indicators to track and measure the progress made during the course of the project.   ***Administrative***   * An exit strategy is necessary for the sustainability of the SUTP project beyond its implementation period. There should be a corpus of funds put in place in lieu of services to the Government of India that the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) is presently providing. This corpus is essential to ensure that IUT's stature is raised to the level envisaged in the National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) as recommended in the Business Plan charted out for IUT. The corpus will allow IUT to function as an independent institution facilitating higher standards of transport planning throughout India. * A planned and focused approach for introducing IUT to cities is needed, starting with the demonstration cities and gradually the network can be expanded to cover other Indian cities. |

***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 +** | <http://www.sutpindia.com> |
| **Please share hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside, external source.** |  |
| **Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents.** | Modules & Toolkits  Newsletters  The above resources can be accessed using the link provided below by visiting the “Resources section” of the main MENU  <http://www.sutpindia.com/> |

***General comments on Communications & KM***

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

**Partnerships**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Partners** | **Describe innovative aspects of the project in working with**  **(limit = 2000 characters for each section)** |
| **Civil Society Organisations/NGOs** | NA |
| **Indigenous Peoples** | NA |
| **Private Sector** | The barriers and risks faced by the Indian transport sector pose a serious challenge for attracting the private sector finance needed for efficient transport infrastructure. The project has built an enabling environment to mitigate these barriers and risks, and promotes private sector investment. The overall project support (including GoI and World Bank components) is focused on developing capacity and institutional structures to demonstrate the viability and applicability of new infrastructure. At the moment, investments from the private sector has not started but in coming years the environment built through the project would encourage private players to bring in more investments. |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** | NA |
| **Other Partners** | Both World Bank (WB) and UNDP are GEF agencies involved in SUTP implementation where WB is a lead partner for SUTP. WB is contributing an amount of US$ 105 Million as IBRD loan for implementing the demonstration project and an amount of US$ 20.3 Million as GEF grant for providing technical assistance at the city as well as national level. GEF grant is aimed to support various reforms enshrined in the National Urban Transport Policy at national level and provide technical assistance and guidance to the cities and states in conceptualizing and implementing these reforms.Apart from WB, participating cities and their respective state governments are playing an important role in the execution of all demo projects through mobilizing co-financing. Municipal Corporations of participating cities are also the partners in the programme. They are recipient of benefits of the project as well as contributor of financial and knowledge resources. |

***General comments on Partnerships***

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**Gender**

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?** | No |
| **If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings?** | No |
| **Does this project specifically target woman or girls as key stakeholders?** | No |
| **Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as key stakeholders this reporting period?** | No |
| **If yes, please explain** | NA |
| **Please discuss any of the points above further or provide any other information**  **on the project’s work on gender equality undertaken this reporting period.**  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). | NA |
| **Please upload the gender or social needs assessment and any other documents related to the project's gender-related results.** | None |

***General comments on Gender***

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

**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?** | None |
| **What is the current status of the grievance?** | None |
| **How would you rate the significance of the grievance?** | None |
| **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.** | NA |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. |

**Approve and Submit Page**

***UNDP-GEF Region-based Technical Adviser (RTA)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RTA Revised Overall Ratings** (optional) | |
| **Revised overall DO rating** |  |
| **Revised overall IP rating** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating** (required only if the Overall DO or IP Rating have been revised by the RTA). |  |
| **Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents** associated with this project that have not been uploaded elsewhere in the PIR(i.e. via the Adjustments, Communications KM or Gender tabs). The files will be saved in the UNDP-GEF PIMS database and used for internal and external learning and communications. | [uploading only possible in PIR system; list here the files that you plan on uploading] |

***NOTE: This generic offline template does not in any way replace the mandatory online 2014 PIR; a completed version of this offline template WILL NOT be accepted as any project’s final PIR, will not be transferred to the GEF, and the project will be in non-compliance with the GEF mandatory reporting requirements***