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| Focal Area | Climate Change - Mitigation | |
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|  |  | |
| Project Review & Evaluation:   1. Has the project mid-term review been finalized? **Yes**/~~No~~   If no, when will it be finalized? Month/Year   1. Has the project terminal evaluation report been finalized? ~~Yes~~/**No**   If no, when will it be finalized? Month/Year | |  | | | |
| Project documentation and information: If available, please list website address (URL) of the project. This may be used in UNDP communications material: www.sutpindia.com | | |

UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor’s Comments

Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating:

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

NA

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

NA

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here: (1,500 words or less). 15000

1. Briefly outline the key findings and recommendations of the MTR or TE reports and the management response.

The project has completed MTR during this reporting period. Key findings of the midterm review are as follows:

* Actual realization of co-financing: it was identified that GoI's contribution to the SUTP project stands at $ 667,395 against overall planned co-financing commitment of $7.13 million, which is less than 10%. It was expected in the MTR that GoI’s contribution to the project is to increase in 2013 onwards and a major co-financing will be towards ensuring the sustainability of IUT.
* Implementation of IUT business plan: IUT's business plan has been partially implemented. It needs to be staffed sufficiently with senior cadre at management levels to develop strategic planning capabilities of the organization. The business plan also recommends for creating a corpus to meet IUT's expenses which is important for its sustainability beyond the project. This is an important key finding of the MTR.
* Lack of active coordination between WB and UNDP project components: it was identified in the MTR that there is no coordination between WB and UNDP project components at a working level though PMU is tasked with managing and coordinating both these components. As one of the consequences IUT remains detached from activities that are happening in states and cities beyond the capital. It might be better to have a direct coordination between WB and UNDP to exploit synergies between these project components.
* Lack of an exit strategy: for projects of this nature, exist strategy must be included in the Prodoc, PID and GEF CEO Endorsement request documents.
* Lack of proper Project Planning Matrix (PPM): Since there is no project planning matrix that is available in the UNDP ProDoc, all the results being produced under the STUP Component 1A are not being captured succinctly.

1. Discuss any problems/issues with the final MTR or TE report or the MTR/TE process.

The following are not the problems and issues, but recommendations of the MTR. These are being considered by the PMU.

* GoI’s co-financing in the project to be increased substantially. This can be achieved through preparing an annual expenditure plan jointly by IUT and PMU against various budget subcomponents (table 4.1 of PID) for the financial years 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 to ensure the funding from GOI and GEF/UNDP is directed towards the capacity building of IUT in the remaining time of the project. Since IUT has been created with cabinet approval, with a unique role to provide support to the MoUD and cities in implementing provisions of the NUTP, immediate steps are required by the MoUD to put in place a corpus for IUT and ensure its long-term sustainability.
* Implementation of IUT business plan through proper staffing of IUT: IUT is expected to function as knowledge management data center (KMDC). In order to facilitate such duties at the State level, it would require the presence of full time IUT staff in at least half-dozen states to liaise with state and city government officials, provide support for collecting data for the KMDC and assist in organizing IUT-led training program.
* In order to increase active coordination between WB and UNDP project components, standing committee meetings chaired by the MoUD should invite WB and UNDP program officers and hold a regular dialogue and explore avenues for involving IUT in the work being done at the cities. Also, an IUT official must participate in WB's mission in cities as an observer and build relationships in cities providing assistance on areas not covered under WB funded project work. This will help to build a working relationship between IUT and cities and ensure that capacity building will sustain itself beyond the project.
* The prepared exit strategy must be put into practice with immediate effect. Otherwise, project sustainability, mainly sustainability of IUT, is questionable as it depends on grant finance.
* Following the recommendations of MTR, the PMU has swiftly initiated the process to review LFA and improve PPM to capture the project results better. Since the PPM was finalized, it is decided to implement this and put into practice from this year PIR reporting. Therefore, updated PPM is already reflected in the development objective section and every year, the progress of these indictors will be reported.

1. Discuss any problems/issues with the GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool.

Reporting of global environmental benefits in the form of mitigated CO2 emissions reduction is part of the World Bank Component 1B. The World Bank also conducted MTR during this reporting period for the component it is leading. One of the actions listed as a follow up actions to the World Bank MTR findings are submission of GHG methodology and estimated that the report shall be completed by 15th September 2013. In the same report, it was reported that preliminary forecast estimated for participating cities is 325,306 tonnes CO2 lower than business-as-usual over 10 years (Pimpri-Chinchwad: 64,515 tCO2, Naya Raipur: 8,527 tCO2, Hubli-Dharwad: 133,733 tCO2, Indore: 17,439 tCO2, and Mysore: 101,092 tCO2).

UNDP Country Office’s Comments

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here: (1,500 words or less). 15000

1. Briefly outline the key findings and recommendations of the MTR or TE reports and the management response.

The SUTP program essentially consists of two parts: Part I, supported by UNDP (with a GEF grant), includes a number of national level capacity building initiatives, which are implemented directly by MoUD; and Part II, supported by the World Bank (with a GEF grant and an IBRD loan), includes a series of demonstration capacity building and investment projects in selected states and cities, which are implemented by MoUD and participating states and cities. This midterm review of Part I activities were only carried out. Following were the observations:

1. Sub-Component 1 of the UNDP-GEF part I aims to strengthen Institutional Capacity Development through the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT). This integrates precisely with the NUTP, which has a vision for IUT to be a “**Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMDC)**” that would sustain and enhance expertise as well as facilitate more informed planning’ and more specifically envisages the institute as ‘suitably strengthened to discharge this responsibility’. National policy linkages between UNDP-GEF and GOI are therefore strong.
2. In terms of the global environmental benefits, the core outcome expected from the project is the reduction in GHG emissions when compared to the baseline scenario. It is difficult to attribute emissions reductions above baseline stimulated by the Part I alone just by its capacity building effort.
3. SUTP has potential to strengthen institutional abilities to mitigate carbon emissions. Firstly by ensuring that data collected for IUT’s Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMDC) will incorporate GHG emissions statistics for cities and states, and possible to measure the impact of new transport initiatives on greenhouse gas emissions. Secondly, by strengthening institutional knowledge of measures to reduce travel demand, and encouraging modal shift to other, less carbon intensive means of transport, the Part I of SUTP will help to mitigate transport GHG emissions. This takes place beyond a predicted scenario in which cities and states build road infrastructure to alleviate traffic congestion.
4. In Part I of SUTP, sub-components 2 and 3 involve the creation of training modules, manuals and toolkits, explain how to implement carbon mitigation measures. Combined with Sub Component 4, promoting the dissemination of sustainable urban transport throughout India, the Part I of SUTP will potentially help build knowledge and awareness among city government officials and broaden their options to seek funding support for several other urban transport related initiatives and programs from JnNURM. Thus global policy linkages between UNDP-GEF and GOI are also strong.
5. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) found a high level of project activity taking place at IUT that has been supported by UNDP. A Business Plan was drafted in November 2011. The process of developing a Knowledge Management Centre has begun with the release of an RFP. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) advised on utilizing an adaptive management strategy to establish the IT server remotely under contract. The IUT is setting up training capacity building activities through the development of courses, manuals and toolkits – 20 drafts have been submitted. Training modules are being undertaken throughout India and are being validated with the support of consortium of UMTC, EMBARQ and GIZ.
6. Dissemination activities take place through the Urban Mobility India Conference once a year, through interaction with course trainees, and the publication of a regular newsletter to the Institute’s 1,300 strong membership. Additionally, dissemination of SUTP activities is carried out by the Project Management Unit (PMU) which promotes the project activities by publishing quarterly newsletter, maintaining SUTP website, holding dissemination workshops and organizing SUTP meet every year. The SUTP annual meet is organized to share the experience and lessons learned by the officials engaged in implementing the ‘demonstration projects’ in various cities.
7. Discuss any problems/issues with the final MTR or TE report or the MTR/TE process.
8. The necessary architecture to define project outcomes and develop suitable indicators against which to measure and track progress were not in the project document. The resulting Log Frame and M&E framework needs to be developed by the SUTP Project Management Unit (PMU) and shared with updates at every meeting of the Standing and Steering Committees.

Project stakeholders need to create an exit strategy for the end of the project. It is suggested that a key part of that exit strategy would be a corpus of funds put in place in lieu of services to the GOI that the IUT is presently providing at no cost. The corpus will allow IUT to function as an independent institution facilitating higher standards of transport planning throughout

1. It is suggested that a corpus could be established for not less than INR 35 crore (INR 350 million) which is equivalent to US $7 million, the unspent amount in GOI’s contribution to this particular component of the SUTP.
2. Discuss any problems/issues with the GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool.

The Log Frame for the project was not defined clearly, therefore, the monitoring framework for the projects need to define the criteria for GHG emission reduction and would have to be defined for the actual working of the Tracking tool.

Dates of site visits to project this reporting period:

There were many visits, but only important ones are 9. 6 visits in 2013 (Chennai- 25-28 June; Mumbai - 15-16 April; Mumbai- 14-15 March; Lucknow - 26 Feb-1 March; Bangalore- 12-15 Feb; Jaipur - 29-1 Feb) and 3 visits in 2012 (Hyderabad- 24-27 Sep; Visakhapatnam - 29-30 Aug; Raipur - 6-7 Aug).

**Dates of Project Steering Committee / Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2012 to 1 July 2013):**

* **31.8.2012**
* **5.11.2012**
* **23.11.2013**
* **8.4.2013**
* **7.6.2013**

PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

|  | **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2011** | **Level at 30 June 2012** | **Level at 30 June 2013** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | Project Development Objective and Global Environment Objective: to promote 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 in India | 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 | Captured in Consolidated World Bank/UNDP PIR report | N/A | This indicator captured in consolidated World Bank/UNDP reporting.  The demo cities Pune and Jalandhar were excluded from 6 demos and also revised the number of demo cities to 5 i.e. Pimpri-Chinchwad, Naya Raipur, Indore, Mysore, Hubli-Dharwad |
|  |  | IUT provides technical assistance to a number of states in implementing various provisions of National Urban Transport Policy (NUTP) | NA | 7 states |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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 | NA | 10 cities (5 project and 5 non-project cities) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1** | Institute of Urban Transport strengthened so as to be able to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy | Business Plan developed to strengthen IUT | NA | Business Plan developed to strengthen IUT | Deloitte has been awarded a consultancy assignment for preparation of "Business Plan for Institute of Urban Transport (IUT)" . Inception report was completed. The final report is scheduled for submission in quarter 4, 2011. | Business Plan has been developed and handed over to IUT for taking necessary actions on the same. The Business plan has suggested that the activities of IUT to be divided into 4 groups:  • Training Services • Information and knowledge management services • Technical Services • Administration 2 urban transport experts and 5 transport planners have been appointed by IUT and the remaining appointments are underway in carrying out the plan. | Business Plan has been developed and handed over to IUT for taking necessary actions on the same.  IUT is in the process of implementing the activities proposed  Following personnel were inducted following the IUT 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 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMDC) operational at IUT | NA | Operational by 2015 |  |  | Procurement under progress |
|  |  | IUT’s knowledge management database is established and operational | 0 | 1 | Not planned during reporting period | Proposals to set up a Knowledge Management Cum Data Base Centre at the Institute of Urban Transport India have been invited. The KMC would broadly have the following 5 components: 1. Information Component - all relevant reports not limited as an E-library. 2. Data Component -  3. Interactive Web based Portal Design & Development 4. On Line Portal Hosting and Data Storage Component  5. Data Collection Component KMC is to be a repository of information, technologies, methodologies, standards and best practices used in the urban transport domain | Procurement under process for a consultant that will set up a Knowledge Management Cum Data Base Centre at the Institute of Urban Transport India |
|  |  | Trial validity data of cities entered into KMDC | 0 | 5 |  |  | 0 |
|  |  | Validation of SLB cities data into KMDC | 0 | 12 |  |  | 0 |
|  |  | Policy research conducted by IUT for MoUD | 0 | 6 research studies (at least 2 studies per year) |  |  | 4 research works were conducted by IUT – (a) Institutions and governance; (b) Financing options for urban transport; (c) Urban growth policy; and, (d) Managing travel demand. |
|  |  | 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 |  |  | none |
|  |  | IUT appraised Comprehensive Mobility Plan (CMP) for cities are approved by MOUD under JnNURM | 0 | 65 |  |  | IUT so far appraised 40 CMPs |
|  |  | Institutionalizing finance support for operation of IUT’s business plan | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  | IUT signs Memorandum of Understanding with states to provide technical support and advisory services on urban transport. | 0 | 7 states (10 cities) |  |  |  |
|  |  | Preparation of Service Level Benchmark (SLB) for cities by IUT | 0 | 60 (assuming each city will have a benchmark established) |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number of DPR evaluations carried out by IUT for MoUD on all technical aspects of urban transport. | 0 | 65 |  |  | 50 DPRs evaluated |
| **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 | 50 trainers | An RFP was prepared for “Individual Capacity development through training of trainers and training professionals (PC2)”. The evaluation of bids is under progress. |  | A total of 47 trainers were trained.  In 2013, trained 35 trainers.   * Training of Trainers, 08 - 10 April, 2013, IUT, Anand Vihar, New Delhi, 21 Participants * Training of Trainers, 16 - 18 April, 2013, IUT, Anand Vihar, New Delhi, 14 Participants |
|  |  | Number of training programmes conducted for Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops | 0 | 5 workshops | An RFP was prepared for "Individual Capacity development through training of trainers and training professionals (PC2)". The evaluation of bids is under progress. |  | 2 ToT workshops. |
|  |  | Number of trainings by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 40 trainings |  |  | 22 trainings |
|  |  | Training provided by IUT on thematic areas for transport sector professionals | 0 | 5 thematic trainings  2 topical trainings |  |  | * 1 thematic training on traffic management * No topical trainings so far |
|  |  | Number of people trained by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 1,000 people |  | Eight Training Programs have been conducted by IUT under SUTP during this reporting period for training of various officials in Urban Transport at National, State and city level:  • Bus Operations (1 programme): the event was held from 18th to 21st April 2011. A total of 27 participants from various organizations participated, which included stakeholders at the State Government level, public transport management officials, local government, planners, policy makers, regulators (police department), etc.  • Public Transport: A 5-day workshop on "Public Transport" was held on 11-15 July 2011 in Goa. The program was attended by 30 participants from 19 different cities belonging to state transport agencies as well as municipal corporations. • Marketing and Communications Workshop for PT Projects: The workshop was held on 25th - 26th August 2011, in Jaipur. The workshop saw participation of around 25 officials belonging to various state road transport agencies, municipal corporations, development authorities and metro rail corporations. • Comprehensive Mobility Plan: a 5 day workshop from 10th to 14th October 2011 at Ahmadabad in association with CEPT University, Ahmadabad. The workshop was attended by about 22 participants from various Municipal Corporations, Development Authorities, and Consultancies. • Mobility issues of Hilly town: the program was held from 2nd to 4th November 2011 at Gangtok. The program was attended by 22 participants who were trained on these subject matters. • Strengthening collaborations for Sustainable Urban Mobility (Interaction with NGOs /Civil Society Organisations): the program was held from 13th to 14th February 2012 at Pune attended by members of SUM Net, as well as representatives from CSE, ICLEI (both from Delhi), and Janwani, Pedestrians First, Save Pune Traffic Movement, Pune Cycle Pratishthan and PVP College of Architecture (all from Pune) • Interactive program to develop a “Resource Generation Policy” for Cities and States: the program was held from 2nd to 3rd April, 2012 at New Delhi and covered subjects such as UTF, need to create absorptive capacity at city/ state level for undertaking projects, legislative framework, TOD etc. • Training programme on Institutional Framework: the program was held from 26th to 27th April 2012 at Hyderabad and was attended by more than 30 participants which included city and state officials from various states across the country. | A total of 929 people were trained on different aspects.   * Trained 514 people through 14 workshops on modules. * Trained 235 people through 8 workshops on toolkit.   Among these, 140 city officials trained.   * 2 capacity building workshops & trained 180 participants (Capacity Building programme , 27-31 May, 2013 at Shimla, 66 Participants; Capacity Building programme , 24-28 June, 2013 at Chennai, 114 Participants) |
| 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 |  | Contract for the consultancy has been signed with the consortium of EMBARQ, UMTC & GIZ on 16 September 2011. The training material is being developed by them.  A total of 3 draft modules have been completed and circulated to the reviewers till date. These are:  • Sensitization  • Demand Assessment Planning  • Environment  Of the remaining, 7 modules, drafts modules on Institutional, Transport Planning, Public Transport and Contracting would be completed and circulated to the reviewers by July end. The balance would be done in August 2011. | Consortium of EMBARQ, UMTC & GIZ prepared modules on 10 topics and submitted to IUT. The final modules are expected to be ready by September 2013.  Trainers and subject experts engaged and training programs developed by IUT. |
|  |  | Toolkits developed by IUT | 0 | 11 |  |  | Centres of Excellence of Ministry of Urban Development and other selected institutes are preparing toolkits on 10 topics.  A total of 7 final toolkits have been received by IUT.  Balance 4 are expected to be submitted by August 2013 |
|  |  | Number of validation workshops conducted by IUT to test the developed training manuals and toolkits | 0 | 10 |  |  | 10 validation workshops conducted. Final documents will be ready for distribution by September 2013. |
|  |  | Sustainable urban transport Standards prepared and released by IUT after peer review | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number of published sustainable urban transport technical manuals | 0 | 10 published priority sustainable urban transport technical manuals | An RFP was prepared to invite bidders for "Preparation of Manuals and Toolkits"(PC3). The process of selecting the consultant is under way. | o It has been decided in the Standing Committee Meeting held on 27 October 2011 that the toolkits (technical manuals are termed as toolkit now onwards) will be made by Centres of Excellence of Ministry of Urban Development, these are academic and professional agencies providing professional support to the ministry) and other selected institutes.  o Work order has been awarded to Centre of Excellences and reputed transport planning institutions to prepare the toolkits. The toolkits being developed by each of the institute are as follows: • Public Transport and Accessibility – IIT, Delhi • Road Safety and  Safety Audits – IIT, Delhi • ITS and Traffic Management – SPA, Delhi • Land use Transport Integration and Density of Urban Growth – CEPT, Ahmadabad • Urban Travel Demand Modelling - CEPT, Ahmadabad • Financing and Financial Institutes - CEPT, Ahmadabad • Traffic Analysis and Performance Measurement – NIT Warangal • Urban Road Capacity and Level of Service Analysis and Traffic System Design - NIT Warangal • Environment Analysis and Strategic Environment Assessment – TERI, Delhi • Transport Demand Management - TERI, Delhi  • Social Impact – SPA, Delhi  The inception and interim report for all the toolkits have been submitted by all except for social impact which is now being awarded to SPA, Delhi. The draft reports are under preparation and are expected to be completed by October 2012. The test workshops for the toolkits is expected to start in October and completed by January 2013. | As per MTR recommendations, this indictor was detailed further under new indictors as listed above and therefore decided to discontinue to report this further. |
|  |  | Partnerships formed with other professional transport organizations, universities and colleges, and institutions to enable such outreach training programmes. | 0 | 3 | Not planned during reporting period | N/A | As per MTR recommendations, this indictor was detailed further under new indictors as listed above and therefore decided to discontinue to report this further. |
| **Outcome 4** | Promotion, awareness-raising, and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP | Quarterly newsletters published and circulated by the PMU | 0 | 4 per year | Two newsletters were published first issue, Vol 1 No. 1 in January 2011 and second issue, Vol 1, No. 2 in April 2011. | GEF-SUTP Newsletter is being published quarterly and distributed to transport professionals, junior and senior officials from different Ministries and State Governments, academicians and students. The aim of SUTP newsletter is to maximise the public awareness about the positive effects of the project and to make people aware of the best practices followed worldwide. 6 volumes of Newsletter have been published till date (4 nos during the reporting period). | A total of 10 Volumes of the Newsletter has been published till now (4 nos during the reporting period).  GEF-SUTP Newsletter is being distributed to transport professionals, junior and senior officials from different Ministries and State Governments, academicians and students. |
|  |  | Number of press releases and brochures about the project disseminated | 0 | * 1 press release per year * SUTP brochure per year | One SUTP project brochure prepared and disseminated | SUTP brochure (link given in Basic Data sheet of this PIR) has been prepared and is disseminated at various events such as dissemination workshops organised by the cities, Urban Mobility Conference organised by MoUD and the annual event organised by PMU under the project. These brochures provide information about the project to the transport professionals, junior and senior government officials from different cities, academicians, students and others. | No press release has been made in the reporting period.  SUTP brochure has been disseminated at various events such as:   * dissemination workshops organised by the cities, * Urban Mobility Conference organised by MoUD * and the annual event organised by PMU under the project.   These brochures provide information about the project to the transport professionals, junior and senior government officials from different cities, academicians, students and others. |
|  |  | SUTP web portal developed, launched and periodically updated by PMU | 0 | 1 | www.sutpindia.com website was launched during inception workshop. Nearly 1757 hit rate (number of people who visited the site) was achieved as on 30 June 2011. It provides notes/proceedings of events, workshops, bids, recruitment notification, etc. | A comprehensive website has been developed (sutpindia.com) that showcases the project, gives details of the projects being undertaken by various SUTP cities and PMU. Necessary disclosures are also done on the site, such as Environmental and Social safeguard documents, EOIs and RFPs of the projects being undertaken by the cities and PMU. Cumulative number of visitors to SUTP website has reached 7088. | The website is being regularly updated.  Cumulative hits received for SUTP website are 19,628.  A new forum has been initiated under SUTP website for exchange of knowledge between experts. |
|  |  | IUT organizes one annual international conference | 0 | 3 | Set up SUTP stall and a video was displayed in Urban Mobility Conference and Expo 2010. | • Annual event for SUTP: the event was organised on 11 November 2011 in Delhi. The event is organised annually where city representatives participate. Issues and scope of solutions are discussed. 60 participants participated including MoUD, IUT, Municipalities, UNDP and The World Bank. • Dissemination Workshops:  o Dissemination workshop on ITS project being implemented in Mysore under SUTP was conducted in Mysore on 21 September 2011. 100 people participated. The purpose of this workshop was to create awareness and consult on SUTP programme with city stakeholders.  o A Dissemination Workshop was held at Pimpri-Chinchwad on 22 December 2011 to spread awareness about the projects being implemented by PCMC (Pimpri Chinchward Municipal Corporation) and the benefits that will accrue consequent upon their completion. It was attended by 120 participants. Objective was similar as above.  o A Dissemination Workshop was held at Indore on 1 June 2012 to spread awareness about the projects being implemented by AICTSL. 60 people participated. The purpose is same as above. • SUTP Stall at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 3 - 5 December, 2011 where the Project PMU and PMC teams participated and set up a stall to disseminate information regarding the project among Urban Transport Professionals. • Three (Two during reporting period) videos on SUTP were prepared and displayed during Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 3 - 5 December, 2011. Also the video is being displayed in cities where dissemination workshop is being conducted. | • Annual events for SUTP: two event were organized during the reporting period:   * 22 November 2012 and * 21 June 2013 in Delhi.   • Dissemination Workshops:   * A Dissemination Workshop was held at Naya Raipur on 18 June2013 to spread awareness about the projects being implemented. 60 people participated. The purpose of this workshop was to create awareness and consult on SUTP programme with city stakeholders.   • SUTP Stall at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 5 - 8 December, 2012 where the Project PMU and PMC teams participated and set up a stall to disseminate information regarding the project among Urban Transport Professionals. |
|  |  | Experience and knowledge sharing workshop for cities and state governments organised by PMU | 0 | 3 |  |  | 1 (December 2012, in Delhi) |

RATINGS OF PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DO Rating: Please review the Development Objective Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. A DO rating will be generated based on your answers.** | |
| **1 Please rate the cumulative progress being made toward achieving the end-of-project targets as reported in the project results framework in the DO page of this APR/PIR** | |
| **2 Please rate the likelihood that the project will deliver environmental and social benefits for an extended period after project completion?** | |
| **3 Please rate the likelihood that social or political risks may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes** | |
| **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 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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | S |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | S |
| **2013 Rating** | S |
| **Comments** | The project is progressing towards achieving its development objectives and is expected to achieve its major global environment objectives; The toolkits and modules are planned to be completed by September, business plan for IUT is already in place and getting implemented, and training initiatives are ongoing as planned. Except the KMDC the project is progressing well. The critical risks faced by the project have been delayed procurement of KMDC consultant that has led to delay in setting up of KMDC at IUT. Non-availability of suitable trainers is an issue that is currently being faced by the project that might delay ‘training of trainers’. Low participation by cities is also an area of concern as the aim of the project is to enhance capacities and awareness of city officials. |
| **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 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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | S |
| **Comments** | The Activities defined in the project document are on track and only development of the KMDC and its settlement in the IUT are the two activities left in the project. The Development of Manual and toolkits are completed and the trainings for the city officials are being conducted by the IUT.  The training of the city officials needs to be monitored at the PMU as well as MOUD level so that not only number, but monitoring and verifiable actions at the city level could emerge.  It is also important that a monitoring system need to be developed by IUT for the verification of the trainings conducted and how such trainings are helping GOI for creating Sustainable transport at the city level.  The trends in the project have been positive with both NPD and NPM taking active interest in the project and supporting the developmental goals. The risk at this moment is the procurement at the UNDP which has been delayed and both NPD/NPM having concerns about the procedural delays. |
| **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 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.** |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** |  |
| **Comments** |  |
| **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 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.** |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** | |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | * The knowledge being generated under the UNDP managed component of this GEF project is noteworthy however, how it is benefitting or linked with the entire GEF-SUTP project is not clear. This issue has been raised a number of times. It is advisable that both UNDP and WB carry a section in their respective reporting on how the project is doing as a whole and where/ how well their work is fitting the entire GEF-SUTP India project. * The efforts to strengthen IUT under this project are noteworthy and it would be good if this institute continues to receive support from MoUD (as per their terms and conditions) while developing linkages with national and international faculty on urban mobility to conduct training programs at a regular basis (even after the project conclusion). * An impact or effect of the knowledge produced under this project is not very clear at this stage. |
| **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 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.** |
| **Other Partners** | |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** |  |
| **Comments** |  |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.** | |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.** | |
| **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.** |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser** | |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | 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. Moreover, within NCDI, there are two Components i.e. 1A (capacity development initiatives lead by UNDP) and 1B (Technical assistance to the Ministry of Urban Development to improve national, state, and local capacity to implement the NUTP lead by World Bank).  Reporting in this PIR is for Component 1A which primarily addresses capacity and knowledge gaps.  Following recommendations of project midterm review (MTR), it is important that the project started capturing all the activities and related Outputs through clearly defined indicators. Since PPM is finalized and agreed by NPD, this will be endorsed due course in PSC. Therefore, the revised PPM is used to report progress of indicators starting from this reporting period. It must be stated that there is no change in the project objective and Outcomes. Activities and related outputs were fine-tuned and PPM will capture the results through clearly defined baseline and target indicators. This will not have any influence on the over project objective and outcomes.  The project is likely to achieve most of its targeted indicators and contribute to the project overall objective provided anticipated impact of Outcome 1 is realized i.e. Institute of Urban Transport (IUT) is strengthened and start providing substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy. The next one is year is crucial for the success and sustainability of Component 1A.  The business plan that was prepared for IUT should be put into operation soon through securing required financing from MoUD in the form of a corpus. This defines the sustainability of IUT in (a) the operation of Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMDC) and start providing services to states and cities (DPR evaluations, and guide them in implementing provisions of the NUTP etc.), and (b) Certification of IUT to serve as accreditation body on Sustainable Urban Transport. Sustainability of IUT defines the success of rest of the project outcomes.  The contractors submitted 10 training modules on sustainable urban transport which are being validated through workshops and subject experts. A total of 11 toolkits are being prepared and expected to be finalized in few months from now. Sustainable urban transport Standards are being prepared and will be released by IUT in few months from now. Accomplishment of all these developments will be reported during next reporting cycle. The project also conducted training of trainers’ workshops and so far trained a total of 47 trainers. In 2013, trained 35 trainers at IUT, in New Delhi. The project so far trained 514 people through 14 workshops on modules; trained 235 people through 8 workshops on toolkit. Among these, 140 city officials were trained.    The project is regularly producing quarterly newsletters, which can be downloaded from http://www.sutpindia.com/resource.php.  There was a delay in the implementation of most of the activities as far as the development objective is concerned, but eventually the project is picking up the required momentum and received an extension until 2015 in order to successfully complete all the expected Outcomes. In fact it took a while for the project to clearly define PPM/results framework that captures all the development and results produced under Component 1A. The project is finding workable solutions to problems within its scope and effectively managing the risks, but sustainability of IUT is still questionable unless the required co-financing is realized from GoI. IUT should be involved in the Component 1B as well in order to expand its network to cities (subnational level) in different states.  Overall, from the RTA perspective this project can be rated satisfactory. |
| **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.** |
| **Marginally 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.** |
| **Marginally 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.** |

PROGRESS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 1- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Institute of Urban Transport strengthened to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy** |
| 1. "Business Plan for Institute of Urban Transport (India)" was finalised to provide Roadmap for IUT (Institute of Urban Transport).   The Business plan has suggested that the activities of IUT to be divided into 4 groups:   * Training services * Information and knowledge management services * Technical services * Administration   In addition, administrative support at the 5 regional chapters is also envisaged  Proposals to set up a Knowledge Management Cum Data Base Centre at the Institute of Urban Transport India have been invited. The KMDC would broadly have the following 5 components:   * INFORMATION COMPONENT - All relevant reports not limited as an e-library. * DATA COMPONENT - * Interactive web based portal design & development * On line portal hosting and data storage component * Data collection component (not part of the RFP)  1. Implementation of Business Plan recommendations are under progress. IUT processed a note for funding on the work carried out by them. Also, discussions are under progress for strengthening IUT. |
| **Outcome 2: Government officials, urban planners, practitioners receive training on various aspects of sustainable urban transport.** |
| 1. The project conducted two training of trainers’ workshops during this reporting period and trained 35 trainers at IUT, in New Delhi. 2. Trained 514 people through 14 workshops on modules 3. Trained 235 people through 8 workshops on toolkit.   Among these, 140 city officials were trained.   1. Trained 180 participants through two capacity building programmes |
| **Outcome 3: Manuals, Toolkits and Standard prepared to serve as reference documents, guides to develop and implement of sustainable urban transport** |
| 1. Consortium of EMBARQ, UMTC & GIZ has been hired as consultant to "Preparation of Urban Transport Manuals". 2. Prepared 10 Manuals and trained 100 training of trainers (TOT). National workshops to validate the documents held between January – March 2013. 3. Final modules have been submitted to IUT by the consultants. Presentation on each module was made on 1 July 13, before the standing committee. 4. Selected four 'Centres of Excellence' (IIT-Delhi, NIT -Warangal, IIT-Chennai, CEPT University-Ahmedabad) and two other institutes (TERI-Delhi, School of Planning and Architecture-Delhi) to prepare "toolkits" on 9 different subjects and submitted the final report for all the toolkits. |
| **Outcome 4: Increased awareness of Sustainable Urban Transport interventions among city government officials and transport sector professionals.** |
| 1. Four issues of GEF-SUTP Quarterly Newsletter were published and distributed to all stakeholders this year. They are uploaded on SUTP and UNDP websites. 2. Website is being regularly maintained and updated. Cumulative number of visitors to SUTP website has reached 19628. 3. SUTP Stall at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 5 - 8 December, 2012 4. SUTP Annual Events were organised on 22 November 2012 and 21 June 2013 in Delhi. |

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IP rating: Please review the Implementation Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. An overall IP rating will be generated based on your answers.** | |
| **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 APR/PIR)?** | |
| **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?)** | |
| **3 Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively?** | |
| **4 Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the APR/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** | |
| **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 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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | Sustainable Urban Transport Project (SUTP) is a complex multi-faceted project that aims at bringing about a paradigm shift in urban transport scenario in India towards more sustainable modes. Up till now several initiatives in capacity building have been taken. The Consultants for 'Strengthening of the Institute of Urban Transport' have prepared the business plan for strengthening of IUT and Consultants are on board and making good progress on 'Implementation of Training & Skills Development Programmes', Centres of Excellence and other selected institutes have almost finalised 'Development of Toolkits'. Apart from these several workshops like 'Annual Workshop', 'One-Day workshop on Procurement Guidelines', have been organised to augment the capacities of Urban Transport Professionals working in the field with special focus on city personnel.  The project management unit is also actively involved in Project Outreach and Dissemination activities, a comprehensive website has been developed (sutpindia.com) that gives project details, provides the necessary disclosures of the cities and presents the bids coming out of the project. We also publish a Quarterly Newsletter to raise awareness and report progress of the project (10 Newsletters has been published till date) and a SUTP Stall was set up at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo 2012. |
| **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 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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | S |
| **Comments** | The expenditure on the training as per the GOI component has started and we expect that the major activities in the project will now be based on the training under component 1A. Except KMDC, all other components are on track. |
| **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.** | |
| **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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** | S |
| **Comments** | The Project is progressing satisfactorily as the activities planned under Component 1A have mostly been achieved and are making good progress specially development of modules and toolkits. The aim of capacity building at national & local level is also being achieved and positive feedbacks from all trainees and participants is being received by GoI o n a regular basis. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.** | |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.** | |
| **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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** |  |
| **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.** | |
| **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.** |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** |  |
| **Comments** |  |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.** | |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.** | |
| **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.** |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** | |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | The progress towards annual targets is partly being monitored on quarterly basis in ERBM (no data is available for last two quarters) and is the same case with comments as well.  No risks have been identified during this reporting period in ERBM. However, “implementation of business plan” for IUT is progressing very slow which is one of the critical risks. As mentioned earlier, if the situation persists, sustainability of other project outcomes will have serious impact.  The project financial delivery is not on track during this reporting period. On an average, the overall delivery (2012: Q3, Q4 & 2013: Q1, Q2) is less than 50%, which is low. AWPs should be realistic in terms of annual budgets as the project is facing low delivery rate every year since its start. PMU should be careful enough in assessing the tasks, annul budget and expenditure.  The business plan for IUT is under implementation and activities such as establishment of Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMDC), financial support from MoUD in the form of a corpus, and certification of IUT to serve as accreditation body on Sustainable Urban Transport are at different stages of implementation. All these aspects define the sustainability of IUT even after project completion. IUT should also be involved in Component 1B so that the developments under Component 1A could be taken on board while implementing demonstration projects.  So far 10 training modules and 9 toolkits were prepared which were validated through validation workshops. A number of training programmes were conducted during this reporting period. Most importantly two training of trainers workshops were conducted and trained 35 trainers at IUT. The project trained 514 people through 14 workshops on modules, 235 people through 8 workshops on toolkits. In addition, two capacity building programmes were conducted where 180 participants were trained. Apparently the project made a good progress in mobilizing the intended target groups for these trainings.  The project is regularly producing newsletters and distributed to all the stakeholders. These are available on SUTP website. Project website is being updated regularly. The responsiveness of the project board in overseeing the project implementation is satisfactory.  Overall, from the RTA perspective, this project can be rated satisfactory considering the progress in the implementation of business plan to strengthen IUT, number of training programmes conducted, and response of project in correcting the PPM based on MTR recommendations. |
| **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.** |
| **Marginally 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.** |
| **Marginally 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

Adjustments to Project Milestones, Project Strategy and Risk Management

Key Project Milestones

Have significant delays occurred in the project start, inception workshop, Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation or project duration?

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key project milestone** | **Scope of delay (in months)** | **Briefly describe change or reason for change** | **Briefly describe the implications or consequences this has had on project implementation** |
| Project Start (i.e. project document signature date) | April, 2010: No delay | NIL | NIL |
| Inception Workshop | June 9, 2010: No delay | NIL |  |
| Mid-term Review | 15 | 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 | 12 | Delay in the implementation of most of the project activities. | Project closure date needs to be revised |
| Project Duration (i.e. project extension) | 12 months extension | 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 30 November 2013. | None |

Adjustments to Project Strategy

Has the project made any changes to its strategy (i.e. logframe/results framework) since the Project Document was signed?

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Made to** | **Yes/No** | **Briefly describe the change and the reason for that change** |
| Project Objective | NO | No |
| Project Outcomes | NO | No |
| Project Outputs/Activities | Yes | Following the recommendation of MTR, project planning matrix/results framework was revised. This captures the results of four Outcomes effectively. |

Risk Management

List number of critical risks as noted in the ATLAS risk log and briefly describes actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **# of Critical Risks (type/description)** | **Risk management measures undertaken this reporting period** |
| Training of Trainers (Strategic) | Since not many trainers are available in the country, 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) | This activity of procurement under the SUTP is being delayed. Even with UNDP, The procurement of services for KMDC is taking more time, which is over 6 months. Since this activity has tight timeline of two year for its completion, in case of any delay would significantly have an impact on the project closure date. |
| Strengthening the capacity of IUT as per business plan (Financial) | A business plan was developed for the strengthening of IUT through the development of Corpus. MoUD is expected to provide the required finance needed for the operation of corpus, which is still pending. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Adjustments general comments:

Finance: cumulative from project start to June 30 2013

DISBURSEMENT OF GEF GRANT FUNDS

How much of the total GEF grant as noted in Project Document plus any project preparation grant has been spent so far? (e.g. PPG + MSP or FSP amount. Do not break down by PPG or project budget.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative total disbursement as of 30 June 2013. (i.e.CDR information up to 20 June 2013) | $1486979.00 |
| Add any comments on GEF Grant Funds | NA |

DISBURSEMENT OF CO-FINANCING

How much of the total Co-financing as noted in Project Document has been spent so far? Co-financing is the amount committed in the project document for which co-financing letters are available

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative total co-financing disbursed as of 30 June this year. Please breakdown by donor. | 665,395 |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of additional co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. | NA |

ACTUAL CO-FINANCING : $

ADDITIONAL LEVERAGED RESOURCES

These additional resources can be from the same donors or new donors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative leveraged resources as of 30 June 2013 | NA |
| Add any comments on Leveraged Resources. | NA |

Other Financial Instruments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does the project provide funds to other Financial Instruments? | NA |
| If yes, please discuss developments that occurred this reporting period only. | NA |

Communications and KM

Tell the Story of Your Project and What has been Achieved this Reporting Period

Sustainable Urban Transport Project (SUTP) has two main components (1) national capacity development initiatives which is being managed by UNDP, and (2) demonstration projects in five selected cities (Hubli-Dharwad, Indore, Mysore, Naya Raipur, Pimpri-Chinchwad) which is being managed by the World Bank. SUTP expects to bring about a paradigm shift in the approach of various planners and decision makers in India's Urban Transport system. The project component implemented by UNDP is expected to strengthen MOUD / IUT to be able to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy ( NUTP) objectives, particularly those directly affecting environmental sustainability.

A sustainable business plan for strengthening IUT has been developed by consulting firm Deloitte. IUT has initiated actions to implement the plan. Following the business plan, IUT recruited 12 personnel. The IUT has invited proposals to set up a Knowledge Management Data Centre (KMDC) at the Institute of Urban Transport India as part of the project. KMDC is expected to have all information pertain to Urban Transport sector and help cities and other stakeholders to provide and access as needed. IUT has also started building individual capacity of various stakeholders by conducting training courses in relevant areas of sustainable urban transport concepts, so far twenty six Training Programs / workshops have been conducted by IUT under SUTP. The training material for 10 modules has been developed by the consortium EMBARQ, UMTC & GIZ. A total of 964 participants have been trained in these trainings. The final modules have been submitted to IUT and it is expected that modules will be ready for publication and distribution by September 2013. Centre of Excellences and reputed transport planning institutions are preparing the toolkits on 10 topics, the final reports for seven of the toolkits have been submitted to IUT. Ten Quarterly Newsletters have already been published providing information on the project, and update of the project progress. PMU also set up SUTP stall at Urban Mobility India Conference cum Expo 2012 where a video showcasing the project was presented. Two Annual events for SUTP were organized during this reporting period. in Delhi. Apart from this, a Dissemination Workshop was held at Naya Raipur on 18 June 2013 to spread awareness about the demo projects being implemented where 60 people have participated. The purpose of this workshop was to create awareness and consult on SUTP programme with city stakeholders. The SUTP website is being regularly updated, the cumulative number of visitors to SUTP website has reached 19,628. A new forum has been initiated under SUTP website for exchange of knowledge between experts.

Adaptive Management this Reporting Period

* Following the recommendations of MTR, the PMU has swiftly initiated the process to review LFA and improve PPM to capture the project results better. Updated PPM is already reflected in the development objective section and every year, the progress of these indictors will be reported.
* The scope of IUT is being expanded to (a) function as knowledge management data center (KMDC), and (b) certification of IUT to serve as accreditation body on Sustainable Urban Transport.
* Project exit strategy is being finalized and is expected to implement this with an immediate effect.
* Training programmes are aligned with the needs. Therefore, (a) based on feedback of international experts, trainers and participants, 5 day workshop has been reduced to 3 day workshops, and (b) Two modules targeted at senior officials (namely sensitization and Institutional framework) have been designed as one-day workshops to be conducted in various cities.

Lessons Learned

In many of the training programmes the response in terms of participants was poor. A set of criteria were developed and forwarded to chiefs of transport departments, to nominate the participants who could learn and contribute appropriately.

PARTNERSHIPS

Civil Society Organisations/NGOs

NA

Indigenous Peoples

NA

Private Sector

NA

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.

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY

Has a gender or social needs assessment been carried out?

NA

If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what are the findings?

NA

Does this project specifically target women or girls as direct beneficiaries?

NA

Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as direct beneficiaries this reporting period?

NA

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).

ENVIRONMENTAL OR SOCIAL GRIEVANCE

NA

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?

NA

What is the current status of the grievance?

NA

How would you rate the significance of the grievance?

NA

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: