

# Annex 3: 2016 PIR Generic Offline Template

As of 1 June 2016

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

***Basic Project Information***

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

***Project Contact Information***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | Mr. Mukund Kumar Sinha - NPD  Ministry of Urban Development (MOUD), Government of India | mukundkumarsinha@yahoo.com |
| **Is the Project Implementing Partner a civil society organization/non-governmental organization?** | No | |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Mr. I.C. Sharma | iutindia.sutp@gmail.com |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Saba Kalam | [Saba.kalam@undp.org](mailto:Saba.kalam@undp.org) |
| **GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP)** | Mr. R R Rashmi  Additional Secretary  Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change | [rr.rashmi@nic.in](mailto:rr.rashmi@nic.in) |
| **Other Partners** |  |  |

***Terminal PIR***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report?** | Yes. However, the project has been extended till March 2018, it was agreed to complete the PIR this year. |

***General Comments on Basic Data***

|  |
| --- |
| Please insert additional comments not explained above. |
|  |

**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 June 2016** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | **Target linked to UNDP and WB component:** The project through the world bank component is working in 5 cities (Indore, Madhya Pradesh  Mysore, Karnataka  Hubli-Dharwad, Karnataka  Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh  Pimpri-Chinchwad, Maharashtra) on urban transport planning process. The world bank component has been extended till March 2018 to realize this objective.  UNDP component is nearly over and the target on capacity building has been achieved except few trainings for master trainers. Remaining trainings will be completed by end of this year.  <http://www.sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu_id=3&mmenuid=3> |
| Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) provides technical assistance to a number of states in implementing various provisions of National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) | N/A | 10 cites | **Target achieved:** IUT assisted 6 states in implementing provisions of NUTP  Uttar Pradesh,  Chandigarh,  Rajasthan,  Sikkim  Madhya Pradesh  Delhi |
| 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 | 13 cities (8 project and 5 non-project cities) | **Target achieved:** The project has provided training and advisory services to a number of project and non-project cities  6 project cities are Indore, Pimpri, Mysore, Naya Raipur, hubli.  8 non project cities are Ghaziabad, Chandigarh, Jaipur, Delhi, Bulandsheher, Hapur, Moradabad and Bhopal |
| Outcome 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 | **Target achieved:** Business Plan for strengthening of IUT has been developed and is currently being implemented by IUT. |
|  | Certification of IUT to serve  as accreditation body  on Sustainable Urban Transport | 0 | 1 | **Target not achieved:** Related request was submitted to the Ministry for approval and has been rejected due to operational reasons. |
|  | Knowledge Management  Data Centre (KMC)  operational at IUT | NA | KMC Operational by end of 2015 | **Target nearly achieved**: Development of the KMC application is over and the process of migrating the application to the production server on the cloud has been initiated. The KMC will be in public domain in September 2016 onwards. |
|  | IUT’s knowledge management database is established and operational | 0 | 1 | **Target achieved:** Knowledge management database and portal is expected to be fully functional by September 2016 |
|  | Trial validity data of cities entered into KMC | 0 | 46 | **Target achieved:** The data for the 46 cities has been incorporated in the Knowledge Management centre. |
|  | Validation of SLB cities data into KMC | 0 | 12 | **Target achieved:** The data for the SLB cities has been incorporated in the Knowledge Management centre. |
|  | Policy research conducted by IUT for MoUD | 0 | 6 | **Target achieved**  4 policy research conducted for MoUD   * Appraisal criteria for Urban transport projects * Citywide Multi-Modal Integrated Transport Plan * Child Friendly Mobility * Electric Rickshaw in Indian Cities: Status & Scope for Improvement |
|  | 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 | **Target achieved**  6 MoUs signed with international institutions  ITDP, GIZ, EMBARQ, LTA, UITP and JTPA. The MoU is being used for working in close collaboration for sustainable urban transport. |
|  | IUT appraised Comprehensive Mobility Plan (CMP) for cities are approved by MOUD under JnNURM | 0 | 65 | **Target nearly achieved**  Only 48 Comprehensive Mobility Plan (CMP) for cities were developed and have been approved by MOUD |
|  | 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. | **Target not achieved**  Pending with MoUD, final decision awaited |
|  | IUT signs Memorandum of Understanding with states to provide technical support and advisory services on urban transport. | 0 | 7 | **Target nearly achieved**  MoUs signed with five states  Uttrakhand, Bihar, Chandigarh, Ghaziabad, Madhya Pradesh |
|  | Preparation of Service Level Benchmark (SLB) for cities by IUT | 0 | 15 | **Target nearly achieved**  SLBs developed-6 by IUT and 6 by CEPT as part of the project. IUT is supposed to assist cities in preparation of the SLBs, SLBs for three cities has not been received by IUT. |
|  | Number of DPR evaluations carried out by IUT for MoUD on all technical aspects of urban transport. | 0 | 65 | **Target achieved**  158 DPRs evaluated by IUT during the project period |
| Outcome 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 | **Target nearly achieved**  79 master trainers trained  <http://www.sutpindia.com/com1a_table_22515.html>  Remaining trainings will be completed this year |
|  | Number of training programmes conducted for Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops | 0 | 5 | **Target nearly achieved**  4 training programmes for training of trainers conducted  <http://www.sutpindia.com/com1a_table_22515.html>  Remaining trainings will be completed this year |
|  | Number of trainings by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 40 | **Target partially achieved**  23 trainings by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops  <http://www.sutpindia.com/com1a_table_22515.html>  Remaining trainings will be completed this year |
|  | Training provided by IUT on thematic areas for transport sector professionals | 0 | 5 thematic trainings  2 topical trainings | **Target nearly achieved**  4 thematic trainings conducted as part of SUTP  10 topical trainings on Metro Rail Systems (2), ITS (3), CMP (1), Urban Transport planning (1) and city bus service (3)  <http://www.sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu_id=7&mmenuid=7#shortlisted> |
|  | Number of people trained by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 1000 | **Target exceeded**  1021 till March 2016. Awaiting approval of funds from MoUD for conducting training for additional 500 participants as approved in the Steering Committee  <http://www.sutpindia.com/com1a_table_22515.html> |
| Outcome 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 | **Target achieved**  10 manuals developed  <http://www.sutpindia.com/moduletoolkit.html> |
|  | Toolkits developed by IUT | 0 | 15 | **Target achieved**  15 toolkits developed  <http://www.sutpindia.com/moduletoolkit.html> |
|  | Number of validation workshops conducted by IUT to test the developed training manuals and toolkits | 0 | 15 | **Target achieved**  15 validation workshop conducted  <http://www.sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu_id=7&mmenuid=7#shortlisted> |
| Outcome 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 | **Target nearly achieved**  14th 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 . 6 newsletter will be published before March 2018  <http://www.sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu_id=5&mmenuid=5#sutpnewsletter> |
|  | Number of press releases and brochures about the project disseminated | 0 | 2 | **Target partially achieved**  1 press release issued by the GOI  <http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=113626> |
|  | SUTP web portal developed, launched and periodically updated by PMU | 0 | 1 | **Target achieved**  The website is being regularly updated.  Cumulative hits received for SUTP website are 31,982.  <http://www.sutpindia.com/> |
|  | IUT organizes one annual international conference | 0 | 4 | **Target achieved**  4 annual international conferences completed  <http://www.sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu_id=7&mmenuid=7> |
|  | Experience and knowledge sharing workshop for cities and state governments organized by PMU | 0 | 3 | **Target achieved**  3 experience and knowledge sharing workshop for cities and state governments organised  <http://www.sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu_id=7&mmenuid=7> |

**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. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year?  Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided?  Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes?  If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.).   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.   Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. sharing workshops continues to expand the reach of SUTP to all parts of the country. |
| Satisfactory |
| **Evidence against framework/logframe indicators:** The project has overall met most of the targets listed in the LFA. The project is steadily progressing towards the goal of achieving its developing objectives and is expected to achieve large part of its global environment objectives by June 2017 in promoting environmentally sustainable urban transport in India and improving the usage of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities. The project has extensively helped cities in reviewing DPRs, developing service level benchmarks as part of the LFA and in some cases over and above that as well. The project developed targeted modules and toolkits which were also disseminated with step by step guidance for planning and implementation of Urban Transport solutions. Target of training 1000 State / City officials has been achieved. Completion of the remaining workshops under Training of Trainers needs to be expedited as this target has not made adequate progress due to unavailability of suitable candidates who could be trained as master trainers. In this regard, IUT in consultation with MoUD has outreached number of master trainers across India and mobilizing them to be part of the project.  The development of the Urban Transport Knowledge Management Centre (KMC) is ongoing and will be completed by September 2016. The consultants have collected the traffic and transport data from Comprehensive Mobility Plans of all the selected cities. Instead of carrying out this activity for 3 selected cities on a pilot basis, the approach has been taken complete data population process for all the 49 cities as the data source is now limited to CMPs. Simultaneously, data validation for all 49 cities is completed. Currently, the project is looking into two key issues for the sustianibility of KMC  • Revenue or Business Model in place for operating the KMC i.e. what will it cost on an annual basis to sustain the KMC operation including for data updation.  • Data updation. The model for regular data updation needs to be finalized.  **Cumulative progress:** Overall the project has been successful in 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. Targets achieved against each indicator is testimony of the fact that the project has achieved major milestones resulting into success and sustainability of the project. Moreover, MoUD acknowledges that the project has built necessary skills of the city and state level officials/transport professionals for building infrastructure for sustainable transport system. UNDP-GEF’s Component has undertaken number of institutional and national level capacity building initiatives that responds to National Urban Transport policy (NUTP) by strengthening the framework for sustainable urban transport in the country. This has been done through two principal components. The first, aimed at building robust institution that is capable of authorizing, planning and delivering sustainable transport, and the second aimed at the individual level, training practitioners and sensitizing policymakers so that they have the understanding and skills necessary to create low carbon transport networks.  **Long term sustainability:** There are two main components of SUTP project: one on national capacity development initiatives (NCDI), which is being managed by UNDP, and another on demonstration projects in five selected cities, which is being managed by the World Bank. The success of the second component (world bank component) is very much dependent on the successful outcome of first component (UNDP). The UNDP component has helped to strengthen the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) and ensuring that besides training, it offers advisory support for long term sustainability to project and non-project cities and is directly engaged by several states. The capacity building efforts has made IUT a national facility to provide continuous advice and guidance on sustainable urban transport planning, implementation and management based on national research and international practices such that funds deployed by GOI for urban transport improvement in cities are used in a meaningful way resulting in tangible benefits even after the project is over.  A satisfactory year overall. The biggest outcome has been the profusion of national- and city-level capacity building initiatives, which has helped sensitize urban transport professionals, policy makers, etc. across the country on the concepts and issues of sustainable urban transport. Along with the demonstration cities component of the project, this capacity building has aimed to strengthen government’s ability to plan, finance, implement, operate, and manage climate-friendly and sustainable urban transport interventions at national, state, and city levels in India. |
| **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. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year?  Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided?  Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes?  If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.).   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 UNDP-GEF project being smaller part of the larger USD 125 million project (WB-MoUD-UNDP-GEF) has contributed significantly and has played an instrumental role in disseminating the success of the project, information management and supervision through the Project Management Unit setup under the project which is responsible for the overall supervision of the bigger project.  Aligning with the national planning process and agenda, the Sustainable Urban Transport Project (SUTP) became the first of its kind project in the area of sustainable urban transport in the country.  **Evidence against framework/logframe indicators:** This is the last year of the project and most of the activities have been completed except the Knowledge Management Center which is also at the last leg. Couple of trainings which are still left, will be completed by end of this year. The Knowledge Management center is in the testing phase and should be functional from September onwards for public use. The project has undertaken all the trainings targeted for transport officials, professionals. The toolkits have been prepared and disseminated. The training modules have been developed and widely used. The quarterly newsletter published and disseminated. However, the number of newsletter initially planned could not be achieved because in couple of quarters the project did not have substantive contents.  **Cumulative progress towards the project objective:** The project has been demonstrating very efficient performance and made a good progress towards its development objective. It is likely that the project development objective and outcome indicators will be achieved by the end of the project. Targets listed against each indicator have been achieved during the course of the project. The Project has helped 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 helped MoUD to achieve three key outcomes   * Developed strong and functional long-term partnership between GoI and states/local governments for sustainable urban transport development: The project helped cities to develop the service level benchmarks, DPRs and signed long term MoUs to provide technical assistance. * Enhanced the capacity of policymakers, planners, researchers, executive agencies, service providers, managers and other professionals involved in urban transport to plan, implement, operate and manage sustainable urban transport systems. The project trained more than 1000 transport professionals and 100 ToTs along with developing and disseminating toolkits and modules on sustainable transport. Modules and toolkit developed under the project has helped city planners, state and national officials and decision-makers understand the importance of environmentally sustainable urban transport in today’s context and formulate and evaluate transport related infrastructure projects. * Created a national resource centre for urban transport to facilitate knowledge and information exchange. A detailed Business Plan developed and is being implemented for making Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) a national resource center for sustainable urban transport planning, training, research and development. The Knowledge Management Centre (KMC) being developed has all the components (transport related statistics, technologies, policies and standards) of a resource pool that will help the stakeholders in taking appropriate informed decisions in their respective sub domains and help improve the quality of the decisions taken on planning and implementation.   **Likelihood to achieve its stated objective and outcomes by end-of-project:** Some of the targets listed in LFA that have not been achieved will be the focus in the remaining period. The project under its current work plan has formulated activities for remaining targets on training master trainers, newsletters, Service level benchmark review, training on thematic areas and signing of MoUs are achieved by the project end.  **Sustainability:** SUTP has so far successfully demonstrated that sustainable urban transportation systems are viable, and necessary for Indian cities. The project has engaged with civil society and policy makers at all levels, raising awareness about and building capacity to implement environment-friendly urban transport projects. Despite many challenges, the project has had a huge impact on the Indian urban transport sector, and with the ironing out of the bottlenecks that are holding it back, the SUTP’s true potential can be unleashed to change the face of urban transportation in India after the project ends. Though the formal closure of the project is in March 2018, the UNDP component is almost over. After 2016, the project will follow the business plan developed for IUT for long term sustainability. The KMC is planned to be managed by MoUD and IUT jointly. The trainers will be imparting trainings to professionals in different cities as per the training calendar developed by MoUD each year. The partnership developed with different cities and MoUs signed will be followed up by MoUD. The project has all right components in place for going on auto-pilot mode.  Put together, the capacity building exercises, demonstration projects in selected cities, and toolkits, manuals, and other standardised documents developed through SUTP have been able to address the much-felt gap in sustainable urban transport development in India, and several cities have expressed interest to replicate the SUTP projects such as Intelligent Transport System (ITS), Bus Rapid Transit System (BRTS), and Non-motorised Transport (NMT).  UNDP component has played a critical role in the larger project of MoUD-GEF. It would have been difficult to achieve the larger objective without successful implementation of the capacity building components. The project satisfactorily delivered all the quality outputs it was meant to achieve this year. |
| **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. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year?  Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided?  Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes?  If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.).   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 2016] |
| [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. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year?  Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided?  Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes?  If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.).   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.   Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| Satisfactory |
| The project has progressed well and a lot of work has been done over the past few years. Most of the milestones have been achieved and work completed during this reporting period, ant it is expected to steer the project towards meeting its developing objectives and its global environment objectives.  Component on demonstration projects on environmentally sustainable urban transport concepts supported by the World Bank are getting implemented while the UNDP supported component 1A has been instrumental in generating capacity building products required to create awareness and knowledge about Urban Transport in institutions and individuals. Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT). The much awaited KMC consultancy has started to deliver this reporting period and by end of this year it is expected that KMC Portal will be functional, that will be another feather in MoUD’s cap. The KMC is expected to add to the score of quality knowledge products already produced under SUTP such as the modules and the toolkits.  Individual Capacity Development through training of trainers and of a group of about 1000 professionals at national, state and city levels:- The initial target of 1000 officials to be trained under the project has been achieved , who were trained in various workshops and dedicated trainings conducted for building capacity of city officials. 79 out of 100 trainers are ready, and the remaining target under the Training of trainers component is expected to be accomplished by end of 2016.  Promotion, awareness-raising and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP:- Through diverse and far-reaching methods, the project management team continues to carry on its good work in showcasing the benefits of the project, and in general issues related to environmentally sustainable urban transport. The SUTP website is regularly maintained and updated , quarterly newsletter are published, related workshops are held, pamphlets and knowledge materials distributed at relevant places, participation in various forums are done regularly. |
| **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. Have all the results framework/log frame indicators been updated to end of June this year?  Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided?  Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes?  If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.).   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 2016] |
| [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. Have all the results framework/logframe indicators been updated to end of June this year?  Is sufficient evidence available to confirm the data provided?  Has this evidence been uploaded to the PIR? If indicators could not be reported on please explain why in the DO rating comments section. 2. Do the indicators adequately measure cumulative progress toward the project objective and outcomes?  If not then please explain the mitigating circumstances in the DO rating comments. 3. Consider the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective and outcomes and end-of-project targets by the planned project closure date. 4. Consider whether sufficient measures will be in place by project closure to facilitate the long-term sustainability of results (e.g. exit strategy, new partnerships, indirect GEBs generated in the ten years after closure, additional co-financing, etc.).   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 2016] |
| [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. |

**Adjustments: evidence to support annual Implementation Progress Rating**

Please complete all sections of this tab. The IP Ratings on the next tab of this PIR should be informed by the inputs in the Adjustments tab. The responses should also be used by the UNDP Country Office to complete the UNDP annual project quality assurance assessment during implementation; the questions under “Annual Project Quality Assurance Assessment” have been aligned with that system. If you have any general comments about the information in this section of the PIR, please note them at the bottom of this page. Please upload the following documents as relevant on the approve/submit tab: project board meeting minutes; stakeholder consultation documents; lessons learned and other knowledge management materials.

***Annual Project Quality Assurance Assessment***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Governance*** | |
| **Are at least 40 percent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?** | ~~Yes~~/**No** |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2015 to 1 July 2016)** | 18th Steering Committee – 21 Jan 2016  15th Standing Committee meeting - 18 Jan 2016 |
| **Did the Project Board function as intended this reporting period?** | **Yes**/~~No~~ |
| **Please add any comments on project governance.** |  |
| ***Annual Work Planning*** | |
| **Have project inputs been procured and delivered on time and budget this reporting period?** | **Yes**/~~No~~ |
| **Will the project be able to close on time as planned?** | **Yes**/~~No~~ |
| **Please add any comments on annual work planning** |  |
| ***Stakeholder engagement and target groups*** | |
| **Please discuss how stakeholders and target groups were directly engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project this reporting period.** | A workshop was conducted in Goa on 22-23rd September, 2015 to get the feedback of officials trained under the Leaders in Urban Transport Planning Program in order to decide if the structure of the program needs to be changed or any topic has to be deleted or added. The officials presented the successful urban transport works done by them in their respective cities after the training course attended by them.  In order to review the “Knowledge Management Centre Portal’’, an Expert Group Consultation workshop was held on 18th May 2016. It was attended by representatives of the MoUD, PMU-SUTP, IUT, UNDP and the consultants UMTC and  VBSOFT team along with a panel of members of the Expert Group. Valuable inputs were received for the development of the portal, another Workshop is planned in July when the portal is complete to get feedback from experts. |
| ***Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)*** | |
| **Please discuss how the project M&E Plan was implemented and used to support effective project management this reporting period (e.g. please consider whether progress data against the indicators in the project results framework was reported using credible data sources and collected according to the M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant; whether lesson learned were used to take corrective actions as necessary; whether evaluations were conducted following the UNDP-GEF guidance available at** [**www.undp.erc.org**](http://www.undp.erc.org)**; and other issues as relevant).** | During the mid-term evaluation, a log framework was prepared and the project progress is reviewed accordingly. |
| ***Social & Environmental Standards*** | |
| **Were any new social and environmental impacts and risks identified this reporting period?** | ~~Yes~~/**No** |
| **Please discuss how social and environmental impacts and risks were managed this reporting period, as relevant.** | NA |

***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** | **on schedule** | | **June - 2010** | **June - 2010** | | **N/A** | |
| **Mid-term Review** | delayed/completed | | 3 - 2012 | 6 - 2013 | | 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/pending | December - 2014 | | | September - 2016 | This is a joint project of World Bank, UNDP and MoUD.  The World Bank component has got significantly delayed due to number of administrative reasons at the city level.  UNDP component also supports the operation of the PMU (for both UNDP and World Bank component), MoUD sought extension for both UNDP and World Bank components till 2018 in order to keep the PMU functioning.  The World Bank component has been extended by DEA.  It was strongly recommended by MoUD to extend the UNDP component for smooth function of the entire project. |
| **Project Closure** | [delayed/pending] | | December -2014 | March - 2018 | | Project closure is delayed due to reasons stated above. | |

***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 2016** |
| Operational | Training of Trainers (Strategic) and Knowledge resources developed under the project. Since not many professionals are available as trainers for transport related issues, retaining the developed knowledge pool will be difficult. MoUD is taking an approach to build the pool of trained trainers under the project. |

***General comments on Adjustments***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**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 efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 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?   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.   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 |
| **Efficiency of outputs:** In general, the project was able to complete the work plan within the stipulated budget. Fund utilization was done appropriately and efficiently and there were no significant cost or time over runs. However, it was pointed out in several meetings that the participation in training events is sometimes uncertain and thus there is a need for a flexibility of approach. Quality and reception of the training is more important than achieving certain targeted numbers. Feedback sessions and projects undertaken by transport professionals as a result of training is more important and that is the clear reflection of the use of trainings. The second important component i.e Knowledge Management Center the quality has surpassed the expectations and that is precisely due to the review committee of the experts, multilateral institutions, transport professionals who reviewed the work against the international standards of such work.  **Quality of project governance and project management:** There are three committees for monitoring of the project. 1) Steering Committee consists of senior most MoUD and city level officials. During the reporting period only one meeting was organized however several one to one meetings to take feedback and guidance was organized with the senior officials. 2) Standing Committee consists of mid-level MoUD officials, PMU, UNDP, World Bank. Number of standing committee meetings held during the reporting period to review the quality of outputs and resolve project level operational issues. The involvement of the Joint Secretary MoUD has been commendable specially to resolve issues arising due to several layers of bureaucracy.  **Risk and adaptive management:** One of the major risks last year was around the training programs which was stalled for a period due to operational reasons mainly the cost of logistics which the finance department of MoUD had objected to. The risk was mitigated in consultation with the senior level MoUD officials. The budget for logistics was approved by the finance department taking into account the similar cases presented to them followed by other Ministries. However, issues around entitlement of trainers during the master training programme took much more time than expected because of MoUD policies. This has now been resolved and the trainings will be completed this year.  **Monitoring and Evaluation:** During the year the project was monitored against the targets agreed in the LFA. In most cases the targets were achieved, the project is still working to achieve the targets mainly on the trainings of trainers. As far as quality is concerned all the deliverables were reviewed and approved by MoUD in standing committee and steering committee. This project has helped to create a wide range of awareness and technical capacities in order to drive the actions on sustainable transport in India. Cities are using the modules and toolkits to set up quality control and management measures in transport planning and implementation. Several feedback events were organized to gather information related to initiatives started by the city officials from the learnings they developed from the project.  Overall, a successful year with some minor slippages that shall be covered during this year. The project has successfully created capacities at city, state and national level that will be useful in future years. The project has satisfactorily achieved the targets this year. |
| **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 efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 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?   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 |
| **Efficiency of outputs:** The project has achieved most of the stated targets as elaborated in the LFA section. Based on the outcomes of the review meetings and the additional information that was gathered from the project proponents and other stakeholders during the feedback workshops, the project was successful in carrying out its tasks and also had a positive impact. The project has been able to occupy a niche that was earlier empty in terms of ensuring environmental sustainability in transport planning and implementation, and it appears that the project has been able to achieve overall objective. The project has delivered most of the activities of the 2015 AWP except few trainings which were postponed due to operational reasons.  **Quality of project governance and project management:** All the outputs and its quality were discussed and approved by the project standing committee and the steering committee. Moreover, specific review committees were formed fo critical acitivities like KMC for daily monitoring and execution. In some cases due to intense review to maintain the quality the deliverables have taken more time than envisaged. The project Management Unit, the project management cosnultants and responsible officers in MoUD have played a major role in resolving issues and providing strategic direction to the project. The senior most officer in MoUD ( Secretary) has reviewed the project progress number of times during the year. The steering committee addressed all the critical issues and resolved for smooth project implementation during the year.  **Risk and adaptive management:** The project team managed to establish good working relationships with key national partners and state and city level entities and that has immensely helped the project to avert risks and ensure adaptive management during the course of the project implementation. The project management has been effective allowing the project to preempt the risks and devise mitigation strategy in advance. The major risk averted last year for successful completion of the KMC in timely manner. In order to cut shot the bureaucracy, a review committee of high level MoUD officials was formed for coordination with other government departments and resolving day to isues related to successful hosting of the KMC.  **Monitoring and Evaluation:** The project Steering Committee reviewed all the outputs and deliverables during annual meetings and regular working level interactions among the Steering Committee members, MoUD officials and the project team. The Steering Committee discussions have been substantive on need and quality of each output and demonstrated a high level interest on the outputs of the project. The project has been active with its communication and outreach work that included participation in major regional fora and conferences on sustainable transport management to showcase the outputs and seek feedback from stakeholders. In this reporting period, the project progressed well with implementation of project outcomes as per the strategic framework and in line with MoUD norms and standards.  Keeping this in view the project overall has achieved the stated objective i.e completion of trainings and setting up the KMC for the reporting period. All the activities delivered were closely reviewed and acknowledged by the national partner. Overall, a satisfactory year with major milestones delivered and outputs accepted by stakeholders. |
| **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 efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 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?   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 2016] |
| [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 efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 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?   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. |
| Satisfactory |
| Attaining sustainable urban transport has become a primary objective with the adoption of National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) by the Government of India (GoI). To foster a long-term partnership between Government of India and the state/local governments in the implementation of a greener environment under the ambit of the NUTP, GoI initiated the Sustainable Urban Transport Project with the support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), World Bank and UNDP. In this regard, the inclusion and implementation of the various components of SUTP in several cities of India has played an important role in implementing and realizing some of the key principles drawn out in the NUTP. Efforts to reduce or contain environmental risks form an important component of SUTP. Like the past few years the SUTP has progressed well which is continually bringing a paradigm shift in the way Urban Transport has been perceived in the Indian context.  Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT): In the context of the NUTP, IUT is envisioned to serve as a national level facility to provide continuous advice and guidance on the principles of good UT planning as emerges from its research. Advice on new technologies would also be regularly available to implementing agencies from this institute. The establishment of the KMC at IUT would further strengthen IUTs resource as well as its decision taking capacity in the field of Urban Planning. During the current reporting period the progress made under the KMC consultancy is satisfactory.  Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT): The capacity building programme conducted at city level has set up a benchmark in terms of outreach and the cardinality of urban professionals who have been sensitized and trained on Sustainable Urban transport issues. Modules and toolkits prepared under SUTP during this reporting phase and in the past have created an impact among urban transport professionals who have been benefited from this project. A total of 1021 transport related professionals have been trained so far which is definitely a commendable effort.    Project Management and promotion awareness raising and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP: The project management unit under the supervision of the National Project Director and National Project Manager have done well so far in supporting, guiding and monitoring the implementation of the project components and have also ensured that the awareness levels of direct and indirect stakeholders on issues related to Sustainable Urban transport planning and its implementation are regularly updated through workshops and online resources such SUTP websites, newsletters etc. Sustainability of the impacts of the project: The crucial phase of this project starts immediately after its implementation which means how the outputs and outcomes are sustained beyond the project period. The project performance has been clearly satisfactory and the focus would now be on sustaining the impact of the project and continually upgrading the capacities of the resources which have been generated during the implementation phase of SUTP. |
| **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 efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 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?   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 2016] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.   1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? 2. Please rate the quality of project governance and project management. For example, in this reporting period did the Project Board address critical issues? Did the project manager effectively implement the decisions of the Project Board? 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively,? 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? 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?   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 2016] |
| [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. |

**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 analysis been carried out this reporting period?**  ***Please note that all projects approved in GEF-6 (1 July 2014 through 30 June 2018) are required to carry out a gender analysis.*** | No |
| **If a gender analysis has been carried out what were the findings?** |  |
| **Does this project specifically target women or girls as key stakeholders?** | No |
| **Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women.**  **Results reported can include site-level results working with local communities as well as work to integrate gender considerations into national policies, strategies and planning. Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values, and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.** |  |
| **Please upload the gender analysis and any other documents related to the project's gender-related results.** | None |

***General comments on Gender***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**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. |
| Achieving sustainable urban transport has become a primary objective with the adoption of National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) by the Government of India (GoI). To foster a long-term partnership between GoI and state/local governments in the implementation of a greener environment under the ambit of the NUTP, GoI has initiated the Sustainable Urban Transport Project with the support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), World Bank and UNDP. Efforts to reduce or contain environmental risks form an important component of this project.  SUTP consists of capacity building programmes and city demonstration projects, which aim to induce a major change in urban transport in India. The project is assisting in the training and professional development of transport professionals in India and has produced manuals and guidelines for urban transport institutions, systems and design processes. The project is also supporting the design and delivery of innovative sustainable urban transport systems in five demonstration cities.  SUTP is supported by the Government of India (GoI), through the Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD), the Global Environment Fund (GEF), World Bank, United Nations Development Agency (UNDP), the states and cities for which the demonstration projects are located within. Key interventions are   * Institutional capacity building: Strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) and Setting up of publication, research, training and library cell and a knowledge management centre (KMC). * Individual capacity building: Individual Capacity Development through Training of Trainers and Training 1000 Professionals - Development of 10 Subject Modules & Training Kits. * Preparation of Toolkits: Preparation of 13 Toolkits. For providing step by step guidance to Urban Transport Planners at National, State and Local level toolkits are being prepared by Centres of Excellence and other institutes such as IITs, CEPT, SPA, TERI; and Promotion, raising-awareness, and dissemination activities to expand and enhance the impacts of the SUTP. Under dissemination activities SUTP Newsletter is published every quarter, Annual meet is held every year, SUTP website is maintained and regularly updated and dissemination workshops are carried out in demonstration cities. * Developing Operations Plans & Business Plan for Unified Metropolitan Transport Authority (UMTA), Urban Transport Fund (UTF) * Developing Operations Documents for Traffic Management and Information Control Centre (TMICC) and National Public Transport Helpline (NPTH) * Developing Guidance Documents for Non Motorised Transport (NMT) Plan, Bike Sharing Scheme and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) * Urban Transport Research * Preparation of GHG Emissions Assessment methodology * Leaders program * Program Evaluation Study of Deployment of Buses by Cities under JnNURM * Preparing Guidelines & Model Contract for City Bus Private Operations; * Demonstration Cities: Demonstration capacity building and investment projects in selected states and cities, which is being implemented by the MoUD and participating states and cities.   The project is promoting environmentally sustainable transport and improving the usage of environmentally friendly transport modes in at least five pilot cities by supporting implementation of the capacity building elements and the public- and non-motorized-transport- related aspects in India. Over time, the project has established benchmarks for improved urban transport system and resulted in wider uptake of similar activities by the cities in the project, as well as other cities in the state. Once the interventions are implemented, they would contribute to reduction in GHG emissions, and presumably also local air pollutants. This should have positive impacts on citizen’s health, damage to local heritage buildings etc.  In all cases, the interventions are likely to improve sustainability of the urban transport system in the cities for general public. In case of major interventions, the avoidance/minimization was a focus, such as provision for BRTS in Naya Raipur, where conformance with the development plan for the new city has been with full public participation keeping general public convenience in mind. |

***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 most significant change this reporting year is the entire process of the KMC development. The standards against which the KMC has been reviewed/evaluated by the review committee of experts is extra ordinary. This has helped the officials understand international quality benchmarks for practices being followed in developed countries. |

***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. |
| IUT has signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with International institutions to build knowledge and expertise of IUT and to sustain the capacity building activities after SUTP project ends. MoU signed with ITDP, GIZ, EMBARQ, LTA, UITP and JTPA for working in close collaboration for sustainable urban transport. The expertise of the organization have been used in various capacity building programs. |

***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 + | [www.sutpindia.com](http://www.sutpindia.com)  <https://www.facebook.com/public/Sutp-India> |
| Please share hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside, external source. | <http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=89193>  <http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=104085>  <http://www.newindianexpress.com/cities/kochi/SUTP-Selects-Detailed-Project-Report-for-Water-Transport/2015/09/29/article3052921.ece>  <http://www.dailypioneer.com/state-editions/raipur/naya-raipur-can-expect-funding-bonanza-in-smart-city-project.html> |
| Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents. |  |

***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** | ***Give the name of the partner(s), and describe the partnership, recent notable activities and any innovative aspects of the work. Please do not use any acronyms.* (limit = 2000 characters for each section)** |
| **Civil Society Organisations/NGOs** | Writers Forum (In association with Kannada and Culture Department, Government of Karnataka) |
| **Indigenous Peoples** | Two rounds of workshops were conducted with writers of twin cities (Hubli Dharwad). Local writers attended the workshops to discuss the details of Hubli-Dharwad bus rapid transit system (HDBRTS), as well as to give inputs on name for the Bus Rapid Transit System (BRTS) and deciding the logo for the BRTS . |
| **Private Sector** | The project through its various consultancies such as the consultancy for business plans for IUT strengthening, the consultancy for toolkits and the training manuals, Consultancy services for KMC, preparation of process documents and many more activities under component 1 A have had involved the private sector agencies. |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** | N/A |
| **Other Partners** | Both World Bank (WB) and UNDP are GEF agencies involved in SUTP implementation wherein 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***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**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?** |  |
| **How would you rate the significance of the grievance?** |  |
| **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.** |  |

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

**Sustainable Development Goals**

The UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor and Programme Associate must complete this section. Please select one or more Sustainable Development Goals that align with the results, impact and type of work of the project. For more information on the Sustainable Development Goals please visit <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/>.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Goal 1 | End poverty in all its forms everywhere |
|  | Goal 2 | End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture |
|  | Goal 3 | Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages |
|  | Goal 4 | Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all |
|  | Goal 5 | Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls |
|  | Goal 6 | Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all |
|  | Goal 7 | Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all |
|  | Goal 8 | Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all |
|  | Goal 9 | Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation |
|  | Goal 10 | Reduce inequality within and among countries |
|  | Goal 11 | Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable |
|  | Goal 12 | Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns |
|  | Goal 13 | Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts |
|  | Goal 14 | Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development |
|  | Goal 15 | Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss |
|  | Goal 16 | Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels |
|  | Goal 17 | Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development |