

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)
FY 2022**

GEF - IDB

IMPORTANT: The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year 2022 (July 1st, 2021, to June 30th, 2022)

of PIR: 7 (FINAL)

PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Low Carbon Urban Mobility for Large Cities		
Project's GEF ID:	4949	Project's IDB ID:	BR-G1006; GRT/FM-14717-BR and GRT/FM-17892-BR
Country/ies	Brazil		
GEF Focal Area/s	Climate Change		
Executing Agency	INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE DESENVOLVIMENTO E SUSTENTABILIDADE; IDB		
Project Finance and Disbursements:	GEF Trust Fund	\$ 6,000,000	
	CO-finance at CEO Endors. / Approv.	\$ 144,581,638	
	TOTAL Project Cost (GEF Grant + co-finance)	\$ 150,581,638	
	Total disbursements of GEF Grant resources as of end of June 30th, 2022 (cumulative)	US\$ 5,053,026.98	
Project Dates:	Date of First Disbursement	11/12/2015	
	Agency Approval Date	10/30/2014	
	Effectiveness (Start) Date	08/28/2015	
	Original Last Disbursement Expiration Date ¹ (OED)	10/08/2018	
	Current CED	1/08/2022	
	Estimated Operational Close Date ² (EOC)	01/08/2022	

¹ For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Completion Date".

² For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Financial Closure Date".

	Actual Date of EOC, if applicable	04/08/2022
Project Evaluation:	Mid-term Date (Expected or Actual)	04/03/2017
	Terminal evaluation Date (Expected)	12/31/2022

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING (DO) & ASSESSMENT

The Project is consistent with the objectives of the "IDB Integrated Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation, and Sustainable and Renewable Energy". The integrated strategy guides the bank's effort to scale-up support for climate change mitigation and adaptation activities in LAC. The integrated strategy calls for enhanced support along five priority intervention lines: (i) strengthening the Bank's knowledge base, (ii) strengthening institutions and private and public sector capacities, (iii) developing instruments to mainstream climate change mitigation and increase resilience in Bank-funded operations, (iv) expanding lending and technical assistance in key sectors, and (v) scaling-up investments, addressing financial gaps and leveraging private sector investments.

Make an overall assessment and provide a rating³ of "likelihood of achieving project objective" during the period (2021-2022). Describe any significant environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation.

OVERALL (DO) ASSESSMENT	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>The project has the CO (fully justified) on March 28th, 2022. All Relevant objectives and targets were achieved. Last Disbursement was on September 16th, 2021. Therefore, the project's developing objectives rating was Satisfactory (S).</p> <p>Regarding Training and Dissemination products (Implemented training activities – Product 3.1 and Dissemination Strategies - Product 3.3), due to the Covid-19 pandemic, there was a need to transform some face-to-face training activities into dissemination webinars. Online events included capacity building for projects and implementing institutions in implementation, leaders, technicians from municipal, state, and federal governments, civil society organizations and other partners, and the publication and dissemination of technical reference books and other care information.</p> <p>Also, 4 courses were given (walking mobility, cycling mobility, demand management, urban mobility information management) and 4 webinars (without Output 3.3). Thus, for the Dissemination Strategies - Product 3.3 was planned to be just one (1), but instead 6 strategies for dissemination were achieved during the project's execution, reaching an extended group of beneficiaries, and increasing the number institutions with potential additional impacts in the medium-term dissemination of the overall low-carbon transport mobility alternatives.</p>	Satisfactory (S)	Satisfactory (S)

³ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT

Make an assessment and provide ratings⁴ of overall Implementation Progress, including information on progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities from July 1st, 2021, until June 30th, 2022. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

OVERALL (IP) ASSESSMENT	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>The Project satisfactorily achieved the objectives and results.</p> <p>The main challenge at project’s closure continued to be the Covid-19 Pandemic, which led to changes in some of the results of component 3, which changed from presential courses to webinars (Product 3.1 and 3.3). However, the webinars were performed by professional companies and communication was appreciated by the participants.</p> <p>Summarizing the products achieved by each component:</p> <p>In component 1, guides and manuals were developed to support the inclusion of greenhouse gas emission reduction in urban mobility projects. The regulatory framework was built to include the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the six technical guides.</p> <p>In component 2, an E-Carbon System was built helping the federal government to evaluate future transport projects. In addition, a methodology was developed for the evaluation of transport projects and its application.</p> <p>In component 3, activities were carried out to train technical groups on the subject. As well as the publication of technical notebooks and reports.</p>	Satisfactory (S)	Satisfactory (S)

⁴ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

RISK RATING & ASSESSMENT

For fiscal year 2022, make any adjustments necessary to the assessment ratings⁵ of overall Project Risk⁶ that you provided in the last PIR (2010-2021). Please include details and remedial measures for High and Substantial Risks, specifying who will be responsible for these measures.

OVERALL RATING FOR PROJECT RISK	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>During the reporting period (2021-2022) the overall risk rating was rated again as Modest (M).</p> <p>Risks related to delays of the mobility strategies, were inactivated because related products such as 2.2 mobility strategies developed, were already developed during the final stage of the project. Another risk related with the project’s organizational structure remained the same during the last year of the project’s execution and all the mitigation activities associated with it were implemented.</p>	<p>Modest Risk (M)</p>	<p>Modest Risk (M)</p>

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Please add information on any progress, challenges and outcomes with regards to stakeholder engagement, based on the project’s activities during its implementation through the 2010-2022 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

<p>The project engaged the main parties involved: IDB, Ministry of Regional Development and IABS.</p> <p>Regular follow-up meetings were held every week between the IDB, the Ministry and the IABS (executing agencies), as well as meetings with each of the contracted consultants in which the IDB and the Ministry actively participated.</p> <p>During the beginning of the pandemic there were difficulties in communication between stakeholders. However, over time, all groups migrated to virtual communication tools, and all actors were able to move forward with high engagement to executing the project.</p>

⁵ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

⁶ These should include risks identified at CEO Endorsement AND any new risks identified during implementation.

GENDER

Please add information on any progress, challenges and outcomes with regards to any and all gender-responsive measures that were undertaken in the project's activities during the 2021-2022 GEF Fiscal Year. Also: Were indicators on gender equality and women's empowerment incorporated in the project's results framework? (Yes/No). If applicable, include the indicator with its baseline, target and current value (2021-2022).

No. This is not applicable for this project.

KNOWLEDGE

*Please add information on knowledge activities and products developed in relation to the project (with GEF or non-GEF resources), with special emphasis on activities carried out during the 2021-2022 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.***

One of the results of the BR-G1006 Project in terms of knowledge products was the preparation of six technical reports (TR) that have been published.

Find these reports in their corresponding links here: [Demand management report](#), [Walking Mobility report](#), [Biking Mobility report](#), [Urban Mobility Information Management report](#), [Transition for Zero Emission Urban Mobility report](#), and [Qualification of Public Bus Transit System report](#).

CHANGES TO PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

IDB’s policies apply throughout the execution of GEF projects. Most changes considered “minor amendments” by GEF would, according to IDB’s regulations, norms, and policies, require EITHER no contractual adjustment at all [e.g., small changes in outputs or parallel co-financing] OR a contractual adjustment that does not require Board approval [e.g., extension of date of last disbursement]. These changes should be reported in the PIR for the Fiscal Year during which the changes took effect.

Please indicate in the table below (with an ‘x’ under Yes or No) which aspects of the project were affected by the changes and provide a short description, as well as a reference to any supporting material uploaded into the Bank’s systems:

In the Reporting Year, were any changes made that affected:	YES	NO	If YES, please briefly describe changes made:	Link to supporting material
Results Matrix/ Outputs: P(a) EOP values, wording of outputs, or addition of outputs?		X		
Component Cost: funding allocated per component (vs. originally approved)?		X		
GEF Co-financing: changes in sources and/or amounts expected?		X		
Dates reported to GEF (e.g., effectiveness, first/ extension of last disbursement, midterm evaluation)?		X		
Executing mechanism (e.g., change of Executing Agency or function of advisory committee)?		X		
Other implementation arrangements (e.g., coordination with other GEF projects)?		X		
Financial [risk] management (e.g., waiver for annual audit or change in % to be justified)?		X		
Management of E&S risks and impacts (e.g., changes to ESMP)?		X		
Management of other risks (e.g., changes due to health/ Covid-19 or security concerns)?		X		

Please note: Should the request or need for any changes arise that, by IDB’s regulations, norms and policies, require authorization at the Manager level or above [see OA-420, OA-421, OA-430 and OA-431], project teams should invariably get in touch with the IDB-GEF Coordination team, preferably prior to discussing such changes with counterparts to ensure proper coordination with and reporting to the GEF.

Examples include, but are not limited to: (i) All substantial and fundamental changes covered by the OA-430; (ii) Changes to the general or specific project objective(s) or to the project’s area of intervention; (iii) Results Matrix/ Outcomes & Impacts: P(a) value, wording of existing or addition of Outcomes, Outcome Indicators, Impacts and/or Impact Indicators; (iv) Components: changes in types of activities that may be financed with project funding (eligibility of expenses); (v) Total Amount of Project Financing (above originally approved amount).

LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES

*If the project generated any lessons learned or best practices during the 2021-2022 GEF Fiscal Year, please provide a short description. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.***

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
Home Office/ Covid-19	Teleworking shown as follow-up meetings can be faster.
Procurement	Technical consultants were hired to support an executing agency.
Knowledge, capacity building and dissemination	One outcome from the webinars is that a lot of people from places other than Brasilia (where the Ministry is located) participated in the events. For a large country as Brazil, this is very positive. So, the lesson learned is that future projects should have a mix of presential and online events to enhance results’ outreach.

ANNEX 1. DEFINITION OF RATINGS

Development Objective Ratings

1. **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”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
3. **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.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
6. **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 Ratings

1. **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”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **some** components requiring remedial action.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **most** components requiring remedial action.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of **none** of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings

Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks of projects should be rated on the following scale:

1. **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

2. **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
3. **Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.
4. **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.