

# Annex 3: PIR Generic Offline Template

As of 4 May 2015

(any changes made to the on-line PIR after this date will not be reflected in the PIR Generic Offline Template)

**Generic Offline Template – 2015 PIR**

**THIS TEMPLATE CANNOT BE USED TO SUBMIT THE FINAL 2015 PIR, THE FINAL PIR CAN ONLY BE SUBMITTED ONLINE.**

**This MS Word file contains the sections to be updated in the 2015 PIR only. Unlike the** *2015 PIR Word Report***, this file contains no project-specific information and does not include the data that is pre-loaded into the 2015 online PIR.**

**Please note:**

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

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

**> This generic offline template does not in any way replace the mandatory online 2015 PIR; a completed version of this offline template WILL NOT be accepted as any project’s final PIR, will not be transferred to the GEF, and the project will be in non-compliance with the GEF mandatory reporting requirements.**

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

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

***Basic Project Information***

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

***Project Contact Information***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | Ministry of Urban Development (MOUD), Government of India  National Project Director:  Mr. Mukund Kumar Sinha | mukundkumarsinha@yahoo.com |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Mr. I. C. Sharma | [iutindia.sutp@gmail.com](mailto:iutindia.sutp@gmail.com) |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Ms. Preeti Soni | [preeti.soni@undp.org](mailto:preeti.soni@undp.org) |
| **GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP)** | Mr Susheel Kumar-GEF OFP | [asmef.susheel@gov.in](mailto:asmef.susheel@gov.in) |
| **Other Partners** | World Bank | [ngupta1@worldbank.org](mailto:ngupta1@worldbank.org) |

***Finance***

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

***Project Milestones and Timeframe***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Revised planned closing date** | *December 2015* |

***Project Supervision***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period (30 June 2014 to 1 July 2015)** | 05-June-2015 Project Standing Committee Meeting |

***Terminal PIR***

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

***General Comments on Basic Data***

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

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

| **Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2015** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Development Objective and Global Environment Objective: to promote environmentally sustainable urban transport in India and to improve the usage of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities. | The number of cities that develop an identifiable urban transport planning process (i.e., managed by professional units/institutions of government, following certain procedures and guidance, and involving various level of analytical work and stakeholders’ participation) increases, by project end. | None of the project cities has an urban transport planning process | All project cities have an identifiable urban transport planning process in place | The project through the world bank component is working in 5 cities on urban transport planning process   * Indore, Madhya Pradesh * Mysore, Karnataka * Hubli-Dharwad, Karnataka * Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh * Pimpri-Chinchwad, Maharashtra   The world bank component has been extended till May 2016 to realize this objective. |
| 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 | 7 cites | 4 states  Uttar Pradesh,  Chandigarh,  Rajasthan,  Sikkim  In case of Uttar Pradesh IUT is already assisting in 3 cities – Ghaziabad (17), Moradabad (1 )and Hapur (3) and discussions are on with the others. The numbers in brackets are the number of projects completed in each city.  The technical support unit is placed in IUT office and comprises of urban transport plans and senior experts. And the assistance provided is for implementation of area improvement scheme, vetting of documents, assessing the impact of projects under implementation and remedial measures etc |
| IUT provides training and advisory services to a number of project cities (5 nos), and non-project cities (5 nos) in implementing various provisions of NUTP. | N/A | 10 cities (5 project and 5 non-project cities) | 3 cities – Ghaziabad, Chandigarh and Jaipur  The result are in form of on ground implementation for smoother movement of traffic, operations plan for city bus service, ITS plan for the city, implementation of PBS etc. |
| 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 | Business Plan for strengthening of IUT has been developed and is currently being implemented at IUT. Following resources continue to serve IUT as part of the business plan.  Following personnel continue to serve IUT as part of the business plan :   * 1 senior training coordinator * 1 junior training coordinator * 1 training assistance * 1 research development officer * 1 research assistant * 1 information cum library officer * 1 publication head * 1 publication assistant * 1 accounts manager * 1 software engineer * 1 clerical assistant |
|  | Certification of IUT to serve  as accreditation body  on Sustainable Urban Transport | 0 | 1 | Related request was submitted to the Ministry for approval and has been rejected. Reasons for the rejection are awaited. |
|  | Knowledge Management  Data Centre (KMC)  operational at IUT | NA | KMC Operational by end of 2015 | Ongoing Activity - The consultant for KMC has been hired on 18th November 2014. Following targets completed:   * Inception report   list of information resources) |
|  | IUT’s knowledge management database is established and operational | 0 | 1 | Knowledge management database and portal is expected to be fully function by Dec 2015 |
|  | Trial validity data of cities entered into KMC | 0 | 46 | UMTC has submitted 30 cities data out of 46 cities. For remaining cities’ data UMTC has committed to submit it by end of August.  KMC is expected to be completed by December 2015 |
|  | Validation of SLB cities data into KMC | 0 | 12 | The data for the SLB cities will be submitted after July. |
|  | Policy research conducted by IUT for MoUD | 0 | 6 | 3   * Review of Urban Transport in india * Urban transport Issues of Small and medium towns Study to Improve and Upgrade IPT Services in Indian Cities   Proposal submitted to MoUD for funds. However not sanctioned |
|  | 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 | 2 –   * ITDP, GIZ, EMBARQ, LTA, UITP and JTPA. The MoU is being used for working in close collaboration for sustainable urban transport. In this regards, the expertise of the organization have been used in various capacity building programs. |
|  | IUT appraised Comprehensive Mobility Plan (CMP) for cities are approved by MOUD under JnNURM | 0 | 65 | 48 (number of CMPs evaluated before 2008 are not included) |
|  | 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. | The proposal has been submitted to MoUD and is under consideration |
|  | IUT signs Memorandum of Understanding with states to provide technical support and advisory services on urban transport. | 0 | 7 | 5 – Uttrakhand, Bihar, Chandigarh, Ghaziabad, BCLL |
|  | Preparation of Service Level Benchmark (SLB) for cities by IUT | 0 | 15 | * 6 by IUT and 6 by CEPT as an initative of MoUD. The rest are to be developed by cities |
|  | Number of DPR evaluations carried out by IUT for MoUD on all technical aspects of urban transport. | 0 | 65 | 152 |
| 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 | 54 |
|  | Number of training programmes conducted for Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops | 0 | 5 | 2 |
|  | Number of trainings by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 40 | 17 |
|  | Training provided by IUT on thematic areas for transport sector professionals | 0 | 5 thematic trainings  2 topical trainings | 4 thematic trainings conducted as part of SUTP   * 8 topical trainings on Metro Rail Systems (2), ITS (3), CMP (1) and city bus service (2) |
|  | Number of people trained by master trainers at the sub-national level through workshops | 0 | 1000 | 760 till March 2015. Balance awaiting approval of funds from MoUD |
| 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 | 10 |
|  | Toolkits developed by IUT | 0 | 15 | 12 |
|  | Number of validation workshops conducted by IUT to test the developed training manuals and toolkits | 0 | 15 | 12 |
| 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 | 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 |
|  | Number of press releases and brochures about the project disseminated | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  | SUTP web portal developed, launched and periodically updated by PMU | 0 | 1 | The website is being regularly updated.  Cumulative hits received for SUTP website are 31,982. |
|  | IUT organizes one annual international conference | 0 | 4 | Completed |
|  | Experience and knowledge sharing workshop for cities and state governments organized by PMU | 0 | 3 | 3 |

**Development Objectives Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** is the person managing the day to day operations of the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| Satisfactory |
| Overall the project is heading towards meeting its developing objectives and is expected to attain its major global environment objectives by Dec 2015 in promoting environmentally sustainable urban transport in India and improving the usage of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities.  The World Bank supported Component of the project is making satisfactory progress in the demonstration cities on issues related to urban transport planning. The 5 demo cities are   * Indore, Madhya Pradesh * Mysore, Karnataka * Hubli-Dharwad, Karnataka * Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh * Pimpri-Chinchwad, Maharashtra   The UNDP supported Component 1 A is complementing the World Bank supported Component in achieving the overall goal of the projects.  ***Institutional Capacity Development , focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport(IUT)***  The strengthening of IUT continues to be manifested as a positive outcome through the implementation of the business plan prepared for IUT .A major breakthrough has been that the KMC consultant which has been on-board since November 2014 and setting up of KMC at IUT is in progress which is of course expected to strengthen not only IUT but also help stakeholders in the urban transport fraternity in taking improved decisions related to urban transport planning.  ***Individual Capacity Development through training of trainers and of a group of about 1000 professionals at national , state and city levels:-***  At every city level capacity building programs, the set of modules and toolkits prepared under the SUTP project are being disseminated for use by Urban Transport planners after providing them step by step guidance for planning and implementation of Urban Transport solutions. The target number of city officials (1000) to be trained under the project will be achieved by end of this year which current stands at 853 no of officials who have been successfully trained  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.  ***Promotion , awareness-raising and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP***  Activities under dissemination such as SUTP website, Quarterly newsletters and experience sharing workshops continues to expand the reach of SUTP to all parts of the country. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| Satisfactory |
| The growing demand for urban transportation in India is placing heavy pressures on the available transport infrastructure and institutions in charge of traffic management, road safety, public transport services, etc. The UNDP-GEF project is supporting to overcome this situation by improving the capacities of government officials and decision makers in the urban transport sector, so that they appreciate urban transport in all its dimensions and develop the skills necessary for undertaking effective and holistic urban transport planning and management.  The project has built capacity of IUT in advising implementing agencies on new technologies as and when they become available for practical applications. The project is disseminating practical and relevant knowledge to practising professionals and managers through training and education programmes. Eventually, it is expected that the IUT will grow to become a center for institutional and professional accreditation and provide technical assistance to organizations involved with urban transport in India.  One of the major objectives of the project i.e setting up of cetral Knowledge repository a Knowledge Management Center has progressed very well. The KMC’s mandate is to identify problems and subject areas for research and policy formulation. Besides, the KMC has been envisioned to transform the IUT into a revenue-generating organisation by enabling cities to purchase authenticated data (demand data, supply data, performance data, impact data, organisations involved in urban transport, etc.). The Knowledge Management Center will soon become operational. The data collection is underway, dabase design is almost over. The testing is expected to start in October 2015. Knowledge Management Centre (KMC) as a learning repository will be open for public use by early next year which will provide access to all the stakeholders working in the domain of Urban Transport and will facilitate systematic collection, assimilation, transformation, loading, interpretation and analysis of data in evolving future policies, programs and strategies. The KMC is going to be an information repository for the data from 34 cities that shall be captured for feeding into the system. Additionally it will also include the 12 cities for which the Service Level Benchmark’s (SLB) have been formulated for MoUD. KMC will through its web portal, host information on Urban Transport which will be beneficial to the Government, Business, Consultants, Academia, Citizens, Policy makers, Industry, Consultancy & Research community besides enhancing the level of awareness of citizens on Urban Transport matters.  SUTP has developed subject modules and toolkits, which have been with the help of leading consultants such as Indian Institute of Technology-Delhi (IIT, Delhi), School of Planning and Architecture (SPA, Delhi), Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology (CEPT), Ahmedabad, National Institute of Technology (NIT), Warangal, The Energyand Resources Institute (TERI), Delhi, and Urban Mass Transit Company (UMTC), and through workshops and training programmes. The modules are developed at the national level and disseminated in major cities and are designed to be basic primers on the issues facing urban transportation. These subject modules (along with toolkits) have been made available at the SUTP website.  The overall project progress is of concern especially the World Bank component. However, the UNDP component has improved over last six months. The World Bank component has sought extension till 2017 ie. 3 years more than the actual project closure date. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point. | HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [DO rating in 2015] |
| [comments] |
| **Project Implementing Partner** is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS). | RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| Satisfactory |
| The cumulative work done over the past few years as well as the work completed during this reporting period is expected to siphon the project towards meeting its developing objectives and its global environment objectives. With the World Bank supported Component demonstration projects on environmentally sustainable urban transport concepts are getting implemented while the UNDP supported component 1A has been instrumental in producing the necessary knowledge products required to build the capacity of institutions and individuals who are directly linked with urban transport planning.  ***Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT)***  For driving an institution like IUT towards sustainable capacity , the implementation of the business plan seems to augur well, however with the evolving needs of IUT, the business plan is being looked at for revival. The project team and IUT in this regard have done well in indicating the need for revising the business plan. The much awaited KMC consultancy has started to deliver this reporting period and by end of this year it is expected that IUT’s stature will further be raised and strengthened by the establishment of the KMC at IUT. The KMC is expected to add to the tally 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 workshops and trainings conducted for building capacity of city officials has now broadened its horizon to more and more number of cities. The remaining target under the Training of trainers component is expected to be accomplished by end of 2015.  ***Promotion, awareness-raising and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP***  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 through the SUTP website , publication of quarterly newsletter and related workshops. |
| **Other Partners**: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank). | RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [DO rating in 2015] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.  Please review the cumulative progress toward end-of-project targets as noted in the DO tab of this PIR and provide a rating on this progress. Please consider the following questions before selecting a DO rating:   1. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve its stated objective? 2. What is the likelihood that the project will achieve all stated outcomes by the planned project closure date?   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective). 2. Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. 3. Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. 4. Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| [DO rating in 2015] |
| [comments] |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

**Implementation Progress**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Outputs reported as of 30 June 2015** |
| **Outcome 1** | Institute of Urban Transport strengthened to provide substantial support to local governments in implementing the National Urban Transport Policy |
|  | 1. The business plan is being implemented at IUT. The manpower suggested have been recruited and are serving IUT as part of the business plan 2. Activities carried out by IUT under various categories during the reporting period are listed below:- 3. Policy research conducted/started by IUT for MoUD during the period (July 2014-June 2015) –    1. Review of Urban transport in India,    2. Urban Transport issues of Small and Medium Towns    3. Study to Improve and Upgrade IPT Services In Indian Cities 4. Training Programs – 5 5. MoUs – Chandigarh 6. International Conference – UMI 2015 7. Topical trainings – CMP (1), City bus service (2), Metro Rail Systems (1), ITS (1) 8. Outcomes of the collaboration formed with international institutions to build knowledge and expertise of IUT MoUD during the period (July 2014-June 2015)    1. Plans to initiate research and training 9. Names of cities for which CMPs have been appraised by IUT and subsequently approved by MoUD during the period (July 2014-June 2015) –   Shimoga, Shimla, Tirupati, Bidar, Devnagiri, Kota and Tumkur   1. Names of States with which MoU has been signed by IUT for providing technical support during the period (July 2014-June 2015) – Chandigarh 2. Names of cities for which SLBs have been prepared during the period (July 2014-June 2015) – NA 3. Number of DPR evaluated by IUT for MoUD – none as funding was closed under JnNURM 4. The consultant for KMC has been hired on 18th November 2014. The period of consultancy is 1 year and the inception report was submitted on 2nd December 2014 and resource document on 24th December, 2014. Both the documents were vetted by IUT and comments and suggestion were sent to the consultant. The remaining deliverables are expected to be completed by November 2015. 5. Quarterly newsletter on Urban Transport issues have been published by IUT and regarding research projects |
| **Outcome 2** | Government officials, urban planners, practitioners receive training on various aspects of sustainable urban transport |
|  | 1. A total of 853 city officials have been trained during the city level capacity building of transport officials held across 16 different cities in India |
| **Outcome 3** | Manuals, Toolkits and Standard prepared to serve as reference documents, guides to develop and implement of sustainable urban transport |
|  | 1. Apart from the 10 Modules and 10 toolkits made in the recent past, 5 additional toolkits were approved by the standing committee members out of which 3 have been completed and the remaining 2 are expected to be completed soon . The status of the 5 additional toolkits are as follows:  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SI No | Tool Kit Name | Consultant Responsible | Status | | 1 | **Revision of CMP Guidelines** | **IUT** | **Submitted** | | 2 | **Urban freight management** | **SPA** | **Under Preparation** | | 3 | **ITS for public transport and BRTS** | **CEPT** | **Submitted** | | 4 | **City transport network** | **IUT** | **Submitted** | | 5 | **Urban Mobility Laws** | **UMTC** | **Toolkit submission is pending as confirmation for workshop is awaited from MoUD** | |
| **Outcome 4** | Increased awareness of Sustainable Urban Transport interventions among city government officials and transport sector professionals |
|  | 1. Two issues of GEF-SUTP Quarterly Newsletter were published and circulated to all stakeholders. The newsletters are also available on the SUTP website. 2. The SUTP Website is being regularly maintained and updated. Cumulative number of visitors to SUTP website has reached 32108.   SUTP Stall was setup at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 25-28 November , 2014 which helped to aware /apprise the visitors to the stall regarding the SUTP project and its various components. |

***General comments on Implementation Progress***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Implementation Progress Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** is the person managing the day to day operations of the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| Satisfactory |
| Achievement of the SUTP outputs during the current reporting phase has been commendable that will ensure manifestation of the expected outcomes.  ***Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT)***  As far as IUT strengthening is concerned the Business plan prepared for IUT is being implemented through the inclusion of required resources such as the Manpower and infrastructural resources which are in place and exhibiting their duties. The start of the KMC consultancy work has been a huge boost in fulfilling the much needed Knowledge Management system at IUT. Additional resources required for KMC have been approved by the Project standing committee and procurement is in process. The KMC consultant has already delivered a couple of deliverables (e.g. Inception report and List of Information resources) and the remaining work is in progress which is expected to be completed by end of 2015. It is expected that establishment of a full-fledged KMC at IUT would further inject impetus in improving the technical decision taking capacities at IUT. During the 13th Standing Committee meeting held on 5-June-2015 under the chairmanship of the National Project Director it was discussed that the business plan prepared for IUT may be revised keeping in mind the evolving needs of IUT.  ***Preparation of Manuals ,Standards and Toolkits***  Based on the positive feedback received from the users of the toolkit and modules (prepared under SUTP project) and the increasing demand for toolkits, the project standing committee had approved preparation of 5 additional toolkits. 3 out of the 5 additional toolkits have now been submitted and being disseminated among urban transport professionals which would further build cognizance of urban transport professionals in planning and implementing Urban Transport solutions.  ***Individual Capacity Development through training of trainers and of a group of about 1000 professionals at national, state and city levels:-***  The capacity building of city officials have so far covered 16 cities across India including 853 officials who have been successfully trained. The response of the participants have been extremely encouraging. The remaining target under the capacity building component is expected to be achieved by end of this year.  ***Promotion, awareness-raising and dissemination of information to expand and enhance the impacts of the GEF-SUTP***  The Project Outreach and Dissemination activities have been carried out by the Project Management team. The SUTP website is being regularly updated with additional information pertaining to the SUTP project. The Quarterly Newsletter published by the PMU has helped to raise awareness on Urban Transport issues as well as reporting the progress of the project (14 Newsletters have been published till date). In addition a SUTP Stall was set up at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo 2014.  ***Status of project expenditures***  Barring the expenditure related to the Training of Trainers and some expenditure under the dissemination activities all other project related expenditures have been in line with the planned budget for the year. However it is expected that all pending activities under Component 1 A will be completed by end of 2015. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| Moderately Satisfactory |
| The project includes two components. Component 1 is targeted at providing technical assistance to MoUD to improve the national, state and local capacity to implement capacity building elements and the public and non-motorized transport related aspects of National Urban Transport Policy. Component 2 includes supporting design and implementation of demonstration projects in five selected cities for creating models of sustainable urban transport solutions. The five cities are: Pune, Pimpri-Chinchwad (in Maharashtra), Naya Raipur (in Chhattisgarh), Indore (in Madhya Pradesh) and Mysore (in Karnataka). As regards the funding arrangement, the IBRD Loan supports three cities (Pune, Pimpri-Chinchwad and Naya Raipur) and the GEF Grant supports Component 1 and activities under Component 2 in all five cities.  The overall project progress is presently rated *Moderately satisfactory* owing to delays in completing the project on time. The first component on capacity building is picking up after some delay, and after a lengthy procurement process the major activity of setting up the Knowledge Management Center has started.  **Delivery of Outputs:** Output 1 (Institutional Capacity Development, focusing on strengthening the Institute of Urban Transport (IUT), New Delhi under MoUD): One of the major component of this out is setting up of KMC. The work on KMC started in November 2014. In last 7 months, the data collection has started, SAP license procured, database design is in progress. Urban Transportation related raw data is generally available in unorganized formats and from multiple sources. Hence in order for this unorganized information resource to be made available to users as knowledge, there is requirement of systematically categorizing information which would allow end-users to have access to a synthesized knowledge repository and eventually help in data classification and retrieval. The KMC as per the plan will be a platform that will act as aggregator of information from various identified sources and transform the information into readily available knowledge for the users. Going forward, the KMC will be beneficial to Government, Business, Consultants, Academia, Citizens, Policy makers, Industry, Consultancy & Research community. Other components are progressing as per the plan, IUT is reviewing the DPRs received from the cities and undertaking policy research to assist MoUD in understanding the impact of specific policy changes or introducing new sustainable urban transport policies.  **Output 2:** (Individual Capacity Development through training of trainers and of a group of about 1,000 professionals at national, state, and city levels): This output has not progressed well in last one year. Only few handful trainings have happened and that too with very limited participants. One of the main reason for the slow progress of this component is due to contradicting policies on reimbursement of cost for master trainers. This has discouraged the trainers to attend training. However, this has been resolved recently and new timeline with location has been recently finalsed by MoUD to conduct trainings.  **Output 3:** Sustainable Urban Transport Manuals and Toolkits developed: The toolkits have been updated and will be disseminated in the upcoming trainings. These manulas and trainings have also been disseminated during big events like Urban Mobility India.  **Output 4:** Dissemination and Outreach: As per the plan, the project was expected to publish newsletter every quarter but in last one year the project published only two newsletter. Apart from routine dissemination activities and that too limited in number the project did not make an effort to innovate new ideas on disseminating project outcomes. Going forward this is a critical component for the project more from the point of view of disseminating the outcomes and results coming out of the pilot cities.  Overall, with a moderately slow progress I would rate this project as “Moderately satisfactory” because except the KMC, component 1 A has not delivered much in the last year against the plan. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point. | HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2015] |
| [comments] |
| **Project Implementing Partner** is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS). | RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| Satisfactory |
| ***Background***  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 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. In this regard the implementation of the business plan for IUT which has been prepared under the SUTP has helped improve the capacity of IUT. 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 853 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 progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. 2. Note trends, both positive and negative. 3. Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| [IP rating in 2015] |
| [comments] |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser. | MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.   1. Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this PIR)? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 2. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 3. Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 4. Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the PIR last year? [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a] 5. Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation. [HS / S / MS / MU / U / HU / n.a]   Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.   1. Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why. 2. Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. 3. Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| [IP rating in 2015] |
| [comments] |

***General comments on Implementation Progress Rating***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

**Adjustments**

***Project Planning***

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Project Milestone** | **Status**  (pick one option below) | **Original Planned Date** | **Actual/Expected Date** | **Comments** including reasons for delays and their implications |
| **Inception Workshop** | on schedule | June 9, 2010 | June 9, 2010 | No delay |
| **Mid-term Review** | Delayed but completed | March 2012 | June 2013 | Due to a delay in the implementation of most of the project activities, the MTR was conducted in June 2013 against March 2012 (as per approved CEO endorsement request document). This will have an influence on the Terminal Evaluation and Project closure date accordingly. |
| **Terminal Evaluation** | delayed | Jan 2015 | Dec 2016 | Delay in the implementation of most of the project activities. Project closure date needs to be revised |

***Critical Risk Management***

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Current/Active Critical Risks**  (pick one option below;  add rows as necessary) | **Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2015** |
| 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. There should be an approach to build the pool of trained trainers under the project.  It is equally important as to how the Knowledge Products (eg. Modules/toolkits/KMC, etc.) prepared under the project are upgraded, made available for utilization by the various stakeholders beyond the completion of the SUTP project. |

***General comments on Adjustments***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**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. |
| ***About the project about – the issue, interventions, and impacts?***  The objective of this Project is to reduce the growth trajectory of GHG emissions from the transport sector in India through the promotion of environmentally sustainable urban transport, strengthening government capacity to plan, finance, implement, operate and manage climate friendly and sustainable urban transport interventions at national, state and city levels, and increasing the modal share of environmentally friendly transport modes in project cities.  **Notable achievements:**   * Implementation of the Business plan has resulted in development of both Institutional and Individual capacities at IUT. * The development of Training Modules and Toolkits have been a great success which have been widely disseminated among transport professionals working in the Urban Transport sector * The capacity building programme at city level have been accomplished as per the annual training plans wherein 853 city transport officials from various cities of the country have been trained in 16 different locations * The Quarterly Newsletter published by the PMU has helped to raise awareness on Urban Transport issues as well as reporting the progress of the project (14 Newsletters has been published till date).   **The beneficiaries have found the project very useful and so have given encouraging feedback**   1. “I am looking after the transport projects in Delhi – Metro, BRT and other transport projects. This is my first time in a toolkits training workshop and I have much benefitted from it.”( Mr KK Satija, Assistant Director, Transport Department, Government of Delhi) 2. “We are running about 3500 buses in Chennai. I have really enjoyed the session and believe that it will be useful in taking our work forward in Chennai.”( Mr Ganeshan, Metro Transport Corporation, Chennai ) 3. “We have a few projects in Ludhiana and Amritsar. This workshop has been helpful because we have learnt about new concepts in urban transport, which would help us understand better and plan well. Hopefully by implementing these new concepts we will save unnecessary costs as well. (Mr Pradeep Reddy, Punjab Infrastructure Development Board) 4. “The capacity building workshops and study tours in India and abroad under SUTP gave us exposure and the logic behind the requirement of Intelligent Transport Management System: Why it is required, how it operates etc. Through SUTP, we visited cities like Ahmadabad, where we saw how useful ITS is for public transport. (Mr Shrikant Shriniwas Savane, Executive Engineer, PCMC |

***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. |
|  |

***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. |
|  |

***Project links & social media***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please list below the website addresses (URLs) that exist for this project, including any links to social media sites. Please include: Project website, Project page on the UNDP website, Adaptation Learning Mechanism (UNDP-ALM) platform, Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, Google + | <http://www.sutpindia.com> |
| Please share hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside, external source. |  |
| Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents. | Modules & Toolkits  http://sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu\_id=5&mmenuid=5#modules  Newsletters  http://sutpindia.com/TopMenuDescription.aspx?status=1&menu\_id=5&mmenuid=5#sutpnewsletter |

***General comments on Communicating Impact***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Partnerships**

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Partners** | **Describe innovative aspects of the project in working with**  **(limit = 2000 characters for each section)** |
| **Civil Society Organisations/NGOs** |  |
| **Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| **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. Also SUTP Stall which was setup at Urban Mobility India conference cum expo, New Delhi 25-28 November 2014 which helped to aware /apprise the visitors from the private sector regarding the SUTP project and its various components. |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** | NA |
| **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***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Gender**

All projects must complete this section.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Has a gender or social assessment been carried out this reporting period?** | No |
| **If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what were the findings?** | No |
| **Does this project specifically target woman or girls as key stakeholders?** | No |
| **Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women.**  Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme). | NA |
| **Please upload the gender or social needs assessment and any other documents related to the project's gender-related results.** | None |

***General comments on Gender***

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

**Environmental or Social Grievance**

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

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

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?** | None |
| **What is the current status of the grievance?** | None |
| **How would you rate the significance of the grievance?** | None |
| **Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here.** | NA |

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