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Introduction

With growing urbanization, increased income levels, greater and more complex mobility needs, and physical expansion of cities, one is witnessing a rapid growth of motorized vehicles accompanied by deteriorating public transport services, and facilities for walking and cycling. This has led to increased congestion, air pollution, rising accidents, severe impacts on the city’s ecosystems, and rising GHG emissions. The urban poor are more severely affected by rising costs of public transport, longer commute times (which can potentially reduce income) and must rely on informal modes in less well-connected areas of the city; these modes may be cheap, but suffer from poor quality. NMT modes (walking and cycling), used predominantly by the poor, have more severely deteriorated, in large measure due to increased motorization. All this has put the spotlight on urban transport, in particular what is often deemed to be inadequate physical infrastructure. It has also led to a re-evaluation of urban transport problems and solutions, with an increasing realization that more environmentally and socially sustainable solutions are needed.

Rising fuel consumption by the transport sector and concerns at the national level about energy security and GHG emissions have not gone unnoticed. Several studies have estimated the investments needed for infrastructure spending in the sector. Policies to enable and guide these investments have also simultaneously emerged. National governments, who have access to international funding, have been driving these policies, processes and projects – often under the assumption that the urban local bodies do not have the capacity to plan and execute them. This top-down approach however, threatens the federal structure, takes the decision-making processes further away from people, makes it even harder for the poorer sections to influence policy decisions and increases the scope for influence by vested interests.

Large infrastructure projects, which are often accompanied by land reforms, are re-shaping cities in an unprecedented manner, causing social upheaval. The environmental impact of these changes is both significant and largely ignored, as are the long-term financial consequences for the country and the city itself.

Need for Analysis of Governance in Urban Transport

Current decision-making with regards to urban transport solutions can be characterized as lacking in transparency, based on limited information, deficient data and analysis, and whose impacts are poorly understood by the public at large. They are often not holistic and tend to deal with problems in a piece-meal manner. Governments, under pressure from the public, the media and the corporate sector, are seen responding to problems with quick fixes, which in the long term could exacerbate the problem. In the absence of a comprehensive approach, ad hoc solutions are often proposed in an opaque fashion. Such solutions can often be socially exclusionary and/or environmentally unsustainable. Large infrastructure projects, deemed to be of strategic importance, are more aggressively pushed through, often giving short shrift to good practices such as comprehensive environmental assessments and meaningful public consultations. This may not only lead to unsustainable solutions but also social distress through displacement of the poor. Urban transport projects are also increasingly being executed through complex public-private partnerships, whose transparency and accountability are questionable.

Large investments attract large projects (and vice versa), often to the detriment of alternative, low-cost solutions; solutions which may actually yield better returns on investment. Such comprehensive cost-benefit analyses and alternatives assessments are largely lacking in the domain of urban transport decision-making.

In order to deal with the problems of urbanization, and urban transport and planning in particular, large scale reform agenda are being pursued and pushed, which include privatization of traditionally public sector enterprises (such as public transport companies), encouraging market-driven land development
and leveraging of land as a resource for urban development (as in the case of most metro-rail projects). Legislative amendments, institutional restructuring and new governance mechanisms are being explored to enable these changes. While some of these reforms may indeed be necessary, the process by which these reforms are undertaken is equally critical. The more transparent and inclusive the process of undertaking reforms, the greater would be citizens' confidence in the proposed reforms and, equally importantly, their buy-in to the proposed reforms so that their implementation can become smoother. It is also more likely that such a process, accompanied by rich public discourse, will foster more sustainable solutions to emerge.

Several countries have developed National Urban Transport policies, plans or strategies to help guide investments. However weak institutions, poor governance mechanisms, inadequate capacity of planners and policy makers, and presence of vested interests have resulted in large gaps between stated policy and actual implementation on the ground. Poor civil society capacity and the absence of robust mechanisms for their participation in the planning and decision-making processes have resulted in reduced accountability of government decision-making. It is therefore critical to understand and analyse the processes of governance, identify the lacunae and map this to the quality of the decisions taken.

Conversely, improvement in the quality of the urban transport decisions are likely to have a significant impact on the city; not only directly in terms of reduced congestion, increased safety and more universally accessible transport systems but also better fiscal condition of the city, greater economic productivity and improvement in a wide range of social and environmental metrics, that are sometimes harder to quantify. As urban transport is inextricably linked to city planning and land use, it is expected that improved processes for decision-making related to urban transport will have a salutary impact on urban planning, which in turn will have positive impacts on the use of other resources. Improvement in the governance of this sector will undoubtedly influence the overall governance systems of the city and foster deeper democratic engagement with citizens.

Objective

The goal of this collaborative initiative is to improve decision-making processes in the urban transport sector by developing a framework for assessing governance and decision-making based on principles of Transparency, Accountability, Participation and enhanced Capacity (of both government and civil society) (TAP-C) in developing cities in the Global South, applying the tools developed to carry out assessments in chosen cases and using the results to identify and push for reforms through civil society partnerships and engagement with government agencies.

Better governance is defined as transparent and accountable, by way of increased participation of a broader array of stakeholders, including ordinary citizens, achieved by a greater availability of information, enhanced capacity of the stakeholders to comprehend and process the information that becomes available and meaningful mechanisms for participation and involvement in decision-making, leading to socially, environmentally and economically sustainable transport solutions.

Background

World Resources Institute (WRI) and Prayas Energy Group developed an Electricity Governance Initiative (EGI) toolkit (finalized in 2007), that was based on a similar rationale of the need for greater transparency, accountability, participation and enhanced capacity in the electricity sector. Building upon the principles and experiences of EGI, the Transport Governance Initiative (TGI) has been launched, starting with this toolkit that will provide a framework for the evaluation of governance processes in the urban transport sector in cities of the Global South, and going forward it is planned to apply this toolkit in specific cases and refine it, advocate for wider adoption of the toolkit, and undertake activities that will improve governance through building of capacity of civil society actors as well as government agencies.

The Transport Governance Initiative starts with the presumption that better decision-making processes are necessary, even if not always sufficient, for improved outcomes. Since the emphasis is on governance processes, the TGI methodology focuses on how decisions are made, rather than what decisions are made.

Geographical Scope

TGI's emphasis since inception has been to make it most applicable to the Global South i.e., developing countries in which cities are undergoing rapid growth and facing similar problems of urbanization in general and transportation in particular. Governance levels and the extent of public participation are also generally low in all such countries and considerable gains can be expected by applying the TGI toolkit. Moreover, it is expected that the bulk of urban population growth around the world will occur in such cities.

Hence cities of the Global South have been kept in mind while developing the toolkit and future activities will be expanded accordingly at each appropriate stage.

Phases

The project was implemented progressively through successive stages. It was envisioned to actively involve research institutions and civil society organizations across countries that focus on transport and public accountability issues and share expertise and research capacity at each stage.

Phase I: Scope and broad framework for TGI

- Research and document current policies and practices, identify the issues and develop a systematic understanding of the governance processes in the urban transport sector across the “Global South” and map them to the four principles namely, transparency, accountability, participation, and capacity.
- Develop a framework of critical research questions about institutional actors and decision-making processes, which would lead to qualitative indicators of governance. This was done collaboratively through broad consultations and in-depth dialogue with partners in at least three countries including India. This was to ensure that the TGI framework is robust and applicable across different countries. WRI (which is actively involved in the transport sector in several developing countries) played a key role in identifying international partners and helped foster a broad-based dialogue on the initiative.
- Organize an international workshop to bring together stakeholders from target countries and cities from the Global South and help refine and finalize the format of the toolkit.

Phase II: Development of the toolkit

The detailed toolkit consisting of sets of qualitative research questions, whose answers generate indicators that assess decision-making processes, each of which would help to capture the quality of the decision-making process, were identified and developed. Detailed explanatory and guidance notes were developed to help teams to use the toolkit in selected cases.

Phase III: Application in pilot projects, review and refinement of the toolkit

Once the toolkit was developed in selected cases (cities), the assessments were conducted by coalitions and inter-disciplinary teams made up of groups with complementary and diverse expertise in fields such as economics, environmental issues, law and social welfare. For this, suitable partners were identified and trained.

Once assessments were carried out in pilot cases, typically several cities in three to four countries, a comparative analysis of the findings led to recommendations and call to action on key issues.
Phase IV: Expanding the application of the toolkit, building capacity and networks, and advocacy

The initiative will plan for the widespread application of the toolkit. For this, systems will be created to enable capacity building (such as guides and training materials) and creating networks of civil society organizations, across countries. The results of these activities would lead to exchange of experiences, advocacy materials and actions that will push for changes in processes, rules and in some cases, legislation that will lead to better governance in the urban transport sector.

The current toolkit is the outcome of Phases I, II and III of the project.

The Building Blocks of Good Governance

The Transport Governance Initiative aims at assessing the quality of governance in the urban transport sector. Doing so requires a definition of a set of characteristics of “good governance” that are universally acceptable and thus eliminates the possibility of a subjective judgement creeping into the assessment.

The framework, used here, is the TAP-C framework. All indicators developed will contain within them the need for processes to be transparent, people and institutions to be accountable for their decisions and actions (accountability being contextual – one may be accountable to laws, to certain rules, to the public at-large, etc.), processes to allow for public participation, and for organizations to have the appropriate capacity to carry out their prescribed duties and functions.

All indicators will thus contain within them the building blocks of TAP-C which are broadly defined as follows:

Transparency

- Quality of record keeping (requirements, versions)
- Active/widespread dissemination/ease of access to (documents, records)
- Timeliness and regularity
- Quality of records (comprehensiveness, usability)
- Formats (medium, language, text/maps/infographics/summaries)

Accountability

People

- Disclosure of interests
- Clear criteria for selection
- Performance-based rewards

Institution

- Clear mandate, jurisdiction, and responsibility with processes to resolve issues in areas of overlap
- Well defined, statutory rules for business – purpose, process, and timelines
- Comprehensive consideration of all aspects of urban transport
- Justification of decisions
- Performance reporting against set targets/standards
- Grievance redressal

Public Participation

- Clarity of public participation processes (notifications, stages, timelines, methods of participation, use of inputs)
- Quality of participatory methods
- Breadth, frequency, and quality of participation
Capacity

- Composition commensurate with the role and responsibility of the body including the ability to create specialized bodies to meet requirements
- Well trained staff that advises and makes information available in formats that are usable by policy makers
- Access to expertise (sector and multi-disciplinary) as and when required
- Availability and access to information, data, surveys, analysis
- Mandate that allows commissioning of studies with appropriate financial resources
- Opportunities for knowledge enhancement
- Length of tenure of the body members to be long enough to enable them to gain reasonable insights and experience, thus strengthening their knowledge base

Elements of an Urban Transport System

While this initiative, aimed at assessing the governance eco-system of the urban transport sector, will not consider any substantive issues, it does recognize that an urban transport system has several elements that must be specifically taken into consideration when policies, plans, standards, projects and evaluations are being made. Often while considering an urban transport system the focus is primarily on the cost and the “time efficiency” (how fast can the system ensure the movement of people or vehicles) with perhaps less consideration of other crucial elements that would ensure the long-term sustainability of the system.

It therefore becomes important to specify these elements or principles of a good transport system, without necessarily defining the specifics of what these constitute in detail or the weightage/priority that is assigned to them. A good governance process will (should) allow for those details to be worked out depending on the context within which those decisions are being made.

It is therefore stated as a priority in this toolkit that any transport system must be:

Environmentally Sound

Urban transport is an extremely large consumer of energy, a primary source of urban emissions (including carbon) and generator of noise. Urban transport infrastructure also exerts a huge pressure on the urban ecosystem. It is therefore critical than any transport system must be evaluated in terms of its short and long-term environmental impacts, and this should therefore be a consideration in all aspects of urban transport governance processes.

Socially Just

Urban transport systems not only have environmental impacts, but also social impacts that have to be taken into consideration. Urban transport policies and projects can affect livelihoods (of users of the system, those involved in transport sector services as well as those impacted by it, such as streets vendors), can cause displacement of people, disrupt social structures (such as neighbourhoods, local communities, cultural traditions, etc.) and otherwise lead to a variety of social phenomena (such as road rage, crime, corruption). Some of these impacts may be long-term and hence harder to predict or quantify, and may require inputs from other fields.

Universally Accessible

Cities are extremely heterogeneous and an urban transport system must be able to cater to an extremely wide spectrum of people in terms of age, socio-economic level, physical ability, gender, geographic location and special needs. While a particular mode may be suitable for a segment of society, urban transport governance has to consider the accessibility of the system as a whole. Affordability (accessible for the poor), disabled friendliness, safety for women, children and senior citizens, and availability (both geographically and temporally) all define the “accessibility” of the transport system.

Safe

Urban transport systems are one of the major causes of accidents in a city and very serious consideration must be paid to the safety of the system as a whole. Policy, plans and designs, quality of the
infrastructure etc. will all contribute to how safe the system will be. In particular, policy makers, planners and implementers must pay attention to vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and street hawkers.

**Equitable**

Urban transport systems contain many different elements and cater to the movement of many different commuters using a variety of modes. The system has not only to provide for these but must do so in an equitable manner. In general, resources must be allocated in a just and fair manner and not overwhelmingly for the benefit of one section of society. This too must be a consideration in urban transport governance.

**Efficient**

The main concern of urban transport planners is to create an "efficient" system for the movement of people. Typically, efficiency can be measured by the time it takes to get from one place to another and the cost – both to the public exchequer, as well as the commuter (including indirect costs). Time efficiency refers to the ability of the system to transport people in optimal time, not the speed of any individual mode of transport per se. In fact, slowing down/eliminating certain modes may increase the time efficiency of the system as a whole. Similarly, trade-offs have to be made on transport system costs, with the public authority considering the capacity of its financial resources as well as the ability of segments of people to pay travel costs as well as the "market viability" for transport service providers.

**Mapping the Urban Transport Sector**

The urban transport sector is typically characterized by a plethora of institutions who share various functions. In order to be able to facilitate assessment of the quality of governance of this sector, data which will help to identify these institutions, along with their jurisdictions and functions, processes, and performance needs to be collected. A mapping of all this data will help in creating a complete picture of the governance ecosystem of the transport sector at a national, state and city level.

Broadly, the urban transport sector will be governed using the instruments below, and the toolkit will contain indicators that will help comprehensively assess their quality, namely:

- **Policy** – Policy instruments consist of laws (statutes) and policy (statement of intent or objectives) and are likely to exist at national, state and urban levels. These are made by a “Policy-making Body”.

- **Plans** – Plans for urban transport will typically be made for the city or metropolitan area. Plans may be fluid (ad hoc) or statutory and may vary considerably in detail. Some plans will be comprehensive and multi-modal, while some may not. Plans are made by a “Planning Body”.

- **Executing Authority** – Urban transport components include both projects and services, which will be provided by an agency, which in this toolkit is referred to as an "Executing Authority”.

- **Regulatory Authority** – The development of projects and in particular, the provision of services, will be regulated, as provided in the law, by a “Regulatory Authority”.

- **Standards** – Execution of projects and provision of services will typically be subject to certain standards. An agency making the Standards is referred to as a “Standards’ Body”.

- **Budgeting** – The execution of projects and the delivery of services will all be linked to the budgets of the respectively responsible bodies. The process of preparing and administrating the budgets is referred to as ‘Budgeting’.

These are the six key functional categories that will cover all governance aspects of the urban transport sector. For conducting the mapping exercise, some characteristics / major components of the urban transport sector for the level(s) at which assessment is being done need to be described. These will include the description of the major modes of public transport, types of para transit, road network, transport systems and an outline of the hierarchy of governance structure which controls this mode. The entire chain of urban transport governance may include urban transport departments, licensing and certification agencies, concerned ministry, and other enforcement authorities like traffic police, etc.

**Exploring the Urban Transport Ecosystem**

To enable the mapping, the first step would be to identify all the modes of transport in the city and investigate the governance ecosystem connected with it.

Once a mode is identified (for e.g. BRT, or a Metro rail), within it, identify:

- the rules and regulations that are applicable to this mode
- the policy-body making the rules and regulations
- the regulating body
- the enforcement body
• the infrastructure associated with it
• with respect to infrastructure, the agencies responsible for
  - funding
  - design
  - standards
  - construction
  - operation
  - maintenance
• for each body listed above, describe each one’s
  - jurisdiction (national, state, city)
  - headed by (description of post, appointed by, etc.)
  - whether it is private/public/private-public partnership (PPP)
  - comes under/reports to (which body)
  - created under which (rule/Act/ordinance)

Additionally, there will be policies and processes that may not be linked to any particular physical transport mode, but would nonetheless influence the urban transport system as a whole. These should be listed next. For e.g. - Urban Governance (including finance) and Planning (urban planning as well as transport planning), environmental and social aspects.

For each of these aspects, list out the associated (or relevant):
• laws and regulations
• institutions
• processes
• standards

Doing this iteratively will help to fill out the various institutions, their structures, the various rules/Acts/l legislations, relationships that will help to understand the urban transport ecosystem.

This exercise should enable the assessment team to tabulate the various categories of information below.

Note: The above exercise can be done in any format. The idea is to be able to get the information needed to fill out the tables below. A group discussion using chart paper may be a good way to get an understanding on the modes, institutions and processes for the city/state/country under consideration.

The assessment team will also have identified the scope of the assessment, which may be national, with or without some specific states, or at state level, or even just at the city level. It is recommended that the full mapping exercise be undertaken – which it to say that all institutions that in some way affect urban transport should be covered – even if the scope is limited, as this will help to clearly identify the institutions/processes that need to be covered.

Once the mapping is done, it should help the assessment team to have clarity of which set of indicators need to be tackled and the targets (to whom these are to be applied to) for each one of them. If multiple states or cities are to be covered, some indicators will have to be evaluated multiple times, while some may have a single target and hence need to be evaluated just once.

A. Institutions

This table will contain a master list of all institutions that are connected with some aspect of urban transport.

Table 1: Institutions: Master List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of agency</th>
<th>Level (National/State/City)</th>
<th>Functions performed (Policy/Regulatory/Standards/Planning/Executive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Policy-making Bodies

For each Policy-making body identified in the master list (table 1), fill out the columns in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy-making body</th>
<th>Type of body* (Full legislative/Committee/Other)</th>
<th>Composition of the body*</th>
<th>Names of few policies</th>
<th>Style of functioning*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Style of functioning should include in brief how policy is made and approved
# The policy-making body (which may be a smaller component of the entire institution) may consist of elected representatives (e.g. a city council or a parliament), a sub-committee or a specially appointed panel, etc.
+ Only the composition of the policy-making body should be provided, not of the entire institution.
Table 3: Regulatory Bodies
For each Regulatory Body identified in the master list (Table 1), fill out the columns in Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Body</th>
<th>Regulatory powers stem from*</th>
<th>Composition of the body</th>
<th>Some of the regulatory functions**</th>
<th>Style of functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The statute/Act/ordinance that confers regulatory powers to the body. In case of a larger statute/Act, the specific section/provision should be cited

** Some of the typical regulatory functions will relate to (indicative list)
- Drivers' licenses and permits for vehicles
- Stage carrier permits
- Infrastructure
- Tariffs

Table 4: Tariff Revisions
For each Regulatory Body identified in Table 3, fill out the columns in Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Body</th>
<th>Name of committee (if appointed for purpose of the tariff revision)</th>
<th>Tariff revised for (mode)</th>
<th>Tariff revised (date)</th>
<th>No. of times tariff revised in last 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Standards’ Bodies
For each Standards’ body identified in the master list (Table 1), fill out the columns in Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards’ Body</th>
<th>Statutory powers stem from</th>
<th>Composition of the body</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Style of functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other key characteristics of regulatory framework from your country/region/city:

Table 6: Planning Bodies
For each Planning Body identified in the master list (Table 1), fill out the columns in Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Body</th>
<th>Planning mandate stems from</th>
<th>Composition of the body</th>
<th>Planning functions</th>
<th>Style of functioning</th>
<th>List of some of the plans made by this body (outputs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other key characteristics of the planning framework of your country/region/city:

Table 7: Executing Authorities
For each Executing Authority identified in the master list (Table 1), fill out the columns in Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing authority</th>
<th>Type of body (municipality, department, public sector company, special purpose vehicle, division, development authority, etc.)</th>
<th>Composition of the body</th>
<th>Executive functions (infrastructure development, transport services, enforcement, etc.)</th>
<th>Style of functioning</th>
<th>Budget provision from (allocations in national/state/city budgets, grants, loans, raised from market, user-charges, special taxes, other sources, etc.)</th>
<th>List of some typical projects/services/duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other key characteristics of the planning framework of your country/region/city:

B. Budgets and Finances
Describe in short, the budgetary process at the national/state/city levels

- How is it made?
- Major urban transport heads
- Major urban transport funds
- Funds transferred from other levels of government (typically higher to lower levels)
- Loans received from any agencies, interest payable, repayment terms

List some of the special urban transport funds/schemes of the government

- Funding for (objectives, types of projects)
- Conditions for access to funds (if any)
- Quantum of funding (over a 5-year period – specify if a different period)
List the major funding by multilateral development banks
• Funding for (objectives, projects)
• Conditions for access to funds (if any)
• Quantum of funding (over a 5-year period – specify if a different period)

List some of the ways in which budgets/funds/schemes/projects are audited
• Names of institutions
• Type of audits conducted

Any other key characteristics of the transport budget and financial framework of your country/region/city:

C. Policy and Legislation

This table will contain a master list of all policies and legislation Acts, statutes, etc. that relate to some aspect of urban transport.

Table 8: Policies and Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Type of legislation (Act/Policy/Rules)</th>
<th>Level (National/State/City)</th>
<th>Salient features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of good governance, two key legislative areas relate to transparency and public participation. Transparency laws may be known as public disclosure, freedom of information, right to information, etc. Similar laws/Acts/rules may exist to ensure public participation in various processes.

Table 9A: Transparency and Public Participation Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Type of legislation (Act/Policy/Rules)</th>
<th>Level (National/State/City)</th>
<th>Relates to (Public Participation / Transparency)</th>
<th>Salient features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the environmental legislative framework will be of importance while considering governance aspects in urban transport.

Table 9B: Environmental Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Type of legislation (Act/Policy/Rules)</th>
<th>Level (National/State/City)</th>
<th>Regulatory agency</th>
<th>Salient features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Projects

List details of some of the urban transport projects/schemes in the cities under consideration
Select projects which are representative of as many aspects of urban transport as possible (scale, type, implementing agencies, etc.). As far as possible only completed projects and services that are operational should be listed.

Table 10: Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Authority in charge for execution of project</th>
<th>Contract type (Private/public/PPP/JV etc.)</th>
<th>Other agencies involved in the project</th>
<th>Level#</th>
<th>Type of project*</th>
<th>Contract**</th>
<th>Studies##</th>
<th>Sanctioning process (both for project and other clearances)</th>
<th>Budget process funded by</th>
<th>Was there a Post-Implementation Review (PIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# national, state/provinces, city/metropolitan region, others
* transport service, mega project, small projects and infrastructural non-infrastructure
** Describe contracting procedures like e-tendering, level at which it is awarded/approved.
## List the studies undertaken for this project, such as Techno-economic feasibility report (TEFRs), Alternatives Analysis, EIA, SIA, etc.

E. Miscellaneous

List some of the controversial decisions, projects, funding, policies, and laws made in the last five years (based on media, academic, and civil society reports).
Indicators

The toolkit consists of 55 indicators across the six functional categories, of:

- **POLICY**
- **PLANNING**
- **STANDARDS**
- **EXECUTING AUTHORITY**
- **BUDGETING**
- **REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

Each indicator comprises of several elements of quality and also relates to one of the aspects of governance, namely TRANSPARENCY (15 indicators), ACCOUNTABILITY (16 indicators), PARTICIPATION (13 indicators) or CAPACITY (11 indicators). Occasionally an element of quality of a specific indicator relates more closely to another governance aspect, different from the one of that particular indicator. In such a case this is indicated next to that element. For example the element of quality “Capacity for Participatory Consultations” within the indicator “Public Participation in policy-making”, is more closely related to the “Capacity” aspect of governance, even though the indicator as a whole is a “Participation”-type indicator.

Assessment

An assessment team, after understanding the relevance of the indicator, and based on the guidance given for each, will carry out an assessment on the assessment forms made available separately to check for each of the elements of quality, along with an explanation for its presence or absence. The details of the team, like the names of the researchers and their organizations, their additional comments and observations, etc will be mentioned on the assessment forms.

Indicator Rating

After conducting in-depth assessments, each indicator is given an overall rating, which is determined by the number of Elements Of Quality (EOQ) met.

The ratings for each indicator is given on the respective assessment form in an easy to use format which is depicted in Summary of Indicators. The team using the format has to assess the number of EOQ the indicator meets, to arrive at the rating for that specific indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>L-M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M-H</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(Low-Medium)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Indicators

### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Elements of Quality</th>
<th>Governance Aspect</th>
<th>Number of EOQ met</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy 1  | Mandate and Capacity of the Policy-making Body | - Clear mandate  
- Selection of members  
- Tenure of members  
- Access to knowledge | 0-1 | L |
|          |                     |                   | 2               | M               |
|          |                     |                   | > 3             | H               |
| Policy 2 | Effective functioning of the Policy-making Body | - Frequency of policy reform  
- Comprehensiveness of reforms  
- Policy process timeframe  
- Setting of the agenda  
- Conduct of meetings  
- Holistic policy consideration  
- Integration with other policy  
- Setting policy outcomes  
- Implementation of policy | 0-1 | L |
|          |                     |                   | 2-3             | L-M             |
|          |                     |                   | 4-5             | M               |
|          |                     |                   | 6-7             | M-H             |
|          |                     |                   | > 7             | H               |
| Policy 3 | Transparency in the working of the Policy-making Body | - Background for policy or policy reform  
- Availability in the public domain of external requirements  
- Meeting schedule and agenda publicly available  
- Minutes of meetings  
- Record keeping | 0-1 | L |
|          |                     |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|          |                     |                   | > 4             | H               |
| Policy 4 | Public Participation in policy-making | - Requirement for public engagement  
- Clarity of public participation process  
- Quality of participatory methods  
- Inclusiveness of the participatory process  
- Capacity for participatory consultations (C) | 0-1 | L |
|          |                     |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|          |                     |                   | > 4             | H               |

### PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Elements of Quality</th>
<th>Governance Aspect</th>
<th>Number of EOQ met</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning 1| Mandate | - Requirement to prepare an implementation plan  
- Requirement to implement the plan  
- Clearly defined monitoring mechanism | A |
| Planning 2| Capacity of the Planning Agency | - Qualification of planning members  
- Tenure of members  
- Access to data  
- Autonomy and access to resources | C |
| Planning 3| Effective Planning | - Clearly defined planning process  
- Comprehensiveness of planning  
- Integration with policy and other plans  
- Defining plan outcomes  
- Consideration for plan implementation | A |
| Planning 4| Transparency in the working of the Planning Agency | - Public disclosure of draft plan documents and planning guidelines  
- Quality of record keeping | T |
| Planning 5| Public Participation in Planning | - Requirement for public engagement  
- Clarity of public participation process  
- Quality of participatory methods  
- Inclusiveness of the participatory process  
- Capacity for participatory consultations (C) | P |
| Planning 6| Legislative review of plans | - Mandate of legislative review  
- Transparency of review process (T)  
- Reasoned review | A |
| Planning 7| Capacity of Legislative Committee for review of plans | - Composition of legislative committee  
- Access to data  
- Authority | C |
| Planning 8| Public Participation in the legislative review | - Requirement for seeking public inputs  
- Quality and inclusiveness of the process for seeking public inputs  
- Transparency of the public inputs process (T) | P |
| Planning 9| Engagement of consultants/Advisory groups | - Criteria for selection of consultants/advisory group members  
- Terms of reference of the consultant/advisory group  
- Transparency in engagement  
- Managing conflict of interest | T |
## Indicator Elements of Quality Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards 1</th>
<th>Mandate of Standards' Organizations</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate of the standards' organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composition of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rules for managing conflict of interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards 2</th>
<th>Functioning of Standards' Organizations</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Active organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Justification of standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparency in the functioning of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards 3</th>
<th>Stakeholder consultations in Standards' Setting</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for stakeholder consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publication for review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards 4</th>
<th>Enforcement of Standards</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Publication of standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advisories on implementation of standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXECUTING AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Elements of Quality</th>
<th>Governance Aspect</th>
<th>Number of EOQ met</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executing Authority 1</td>
<td>Staffing policies and capacity of the Executing Authority</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear criteria for appointment of senior staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenure of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authority to appoint departmental staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composition of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for skill-enhancement of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing Authority 2</th>
<th>Effective functioning of the Executing Authority</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity about mandate and function of executing authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-defined public interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective public interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grievance redressal system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for public consultations (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparency in functioning (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent review and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing Authority 3</th>
<th>Performance-based incentives</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Performance metrics specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparent review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance review outcomes specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparency of performance review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing Authority 4</th>
<th>Reporting by the Executing Authority</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Publication of medium-term strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordination with other executive agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for annual planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for annual reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comprehensiveness of reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reporting on process improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of legislative review of executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing Authority 5</th>
<th>Capacity for strategy and planning</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existence of strategy and planning cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualification of strategy and planning personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to knowledge and skill enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing Authority 6</th>
<th>Project selection</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Well-defined process for determination of the projects to be implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement to be part of the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for alternatives analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for feasibility studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing consultant conflict of interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparency in project selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparency in selection process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment against policy goals and metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executing Authority 7</th>
<th>Public Participation in project selection</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement for stakeholder consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Executing Authority 8 | Project specification | • Specification of detailed project design documents  
• Requirement to prepare detailed project reports  
• Comprehensiveness of detailed project reports  
• Project time-line specification  
• Project outcomes specification  
• Availability of project documents in public domain | 0-1 | L | 2-4 | M | > 4 | H |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Executing Authority 9 | Public Participation in project specification | • Requirement for stakeholder consultations  
• Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process | 0 | L | 1 | M | 2 | H |
| Executing Authority 10 | Project contracting process | • Clarity on contracting process  
• Transparency in preparing contracts  
• Transparency in contracting  
• Fair bidding procedures  
• Provision of information to bidders  
• Safeguards against “aggressive bidding” | 0-1 | L | 2-3 | M | > 5 | H |
| Executing Authority 11 | Project contract execution | • Well-defined process for monitoring  
• Enforcement of contractual terms and conditions  
• Legislative review of executive actions  
• Transparency of legislative review actions (T) | 0-1 | L | 2 | M | > 3 | H |
| Executing Authority 12 | Physical audit of projects | • Specification of audit criteria  
• Clarity of audit process  
• Neutrality of audit agency  
• Response of executive  
• Compliance report by contractor | 0-1 | L | 2-3 | M | > 4 | H |
| Executing Authority 13 | Public Participation in physical audits | • Requirement for stakeholder consultations  
• Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process | 0 | L | 1 | M | 2 | H |
| Executing Authority 14 | Transparency during project execution | • Requirement for publication of project reports  
• Project information publicly displayed  
• Availability of public grievance redress  
• Project implementation status published | 0-1 | L | 2 | M | > 3 | H |
| Executing Authority 15 | Post-implementation review | • Statutory requirement for post-implementation reviews  
• Conflict of interest rules  
• Transparency of review process  
• Legislative review of report  
• Impact of post-implementation reviews | 0-1 | L | 2 | M | > 3 | H |
| Executing Authority 16 | Public Participation in post-implementation review | • Requirement for stakeholder consultations  
• Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process | 0 | L | 1 | M | 2 | H |
| Executing Authority 17 | Capacity for project contracting, specification, execution, audit and post-implementation review | • Robust process for preparing project design, execution and evaluation documents  
• Periodic review of project design, execution and evaluation documents and operational procedures  
• Training and access to expertise | 0-1 | L | 2 | M | 3 | H |
| Executing Authority 18 | EIA and SIA of projects | • Requirement for EIA/SIA  
• Comprehensiveness of EIA/SIA  
• Response of the environmental agency  
• Response of the executing authority  
• Transparency of process (T) | 0-1 | L | 2-3 | M | > 4 | H |
| Executing Authority 19 | Public participation in EIA and SIA | • Requirement for stakeholder consultations  
• Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process | 0 | L | 1 | M | 2 | H |
| Executing Authority 20 | Capacity for carrying out EIA and SIA | • Training and skill enhancement opportunities for EIA/SIA  
• Designated staff  
• Dedicated financial/resources | 0-1 | L | 2 | M | 3 | H |
### BUDGETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Elements of Quality</th>
<th>Governance Aspect</th>
<th>Number of EOQ met</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Budgeting 1 | • Clarity of budgeting process  
• Requirement for plan implementation  
• Criteria for budget allocations  
• Outcome budgeting  
• Budget financing | A | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | > 4             | H               |
| Budgeting 2 | • Qualification/experience of budgeting staff  
• Training and skill enhancement  
• Access to knowledge | C | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | > 4             | H               |
| Budgeting 3 | • Provision for seeking public inputs  
• Allocation for public-suggested projects specified  
• Well-defined participatory process  
• Participatory process inclusive  
• Public comments on draft budget  
• Budgets available to the public | P | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | > 4             | H               |
| Budgeting 4 | • Criteria for legislative review  
• Rationale for changes  
• Transparency of legislative review process | T | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |
| Budgeting 5 | • Clarity on re-allocation process  
• Criteria for re-allocations  
• Transparency of the change process | T | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |
| Budgeting 6 | • Requirement for public inputs on budget re-allocation  
• Clarity on the public consultation process  
• Quality and inclusiveness of the public consultation process | P | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |
| Budgeting 7 | • Clarity on audit process  
• Audit results published  
• Audit information used for future planning | A | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |

### REGULATORY AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Elements of Quality</th>
<th>Governance Aspect</th>
<th>Number of EOQ met</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Regulatory Authority 1 | • Existence and neutrality of the Regulatory Authority  
• Independent regulatory body  
• Appointment of members  
• Managing conflict of interest  
• Policy for post-separation employment | A | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3-4             | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 2 | • Clarity of role  
• Breadth of jurisdiction  
• Mandate  
• Authority to enforce  
• Clarity of power of executive direction  
• Transparency in executive direction (T)  
• Tenure  
• Financial autonomy | C | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2-3             | L-M             |
|           |                                                        |                   | 4               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 5               | M-H             |
|           |                                                        |                   | > 6             | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 3 | • Qualification of members  
• Opportunities for skill enhancement  
• Access to knowledge | C | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 4 | • Clarity in functioning of the Regulatory Authority  
• Decision-making criteria  
• Record keeping  
• Time-frame for decisions  
• Justification for decisions  
• Publication of orders/decisions | T | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | > 4             | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 5 | • Public consultations in regulatory decision-making  
• Requirement for stakeholder consultations  
• Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultations  
• Publication of public comments and response | P | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 6 | • Re-negotiation/termination of contracts  
• Initiation of re-negotiation/termination proceedings  
• Clarity of re-negotiating/termination process  
• Public consultation  
• Submission of report by the regulatory authority  
• Review by the executive | T | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2-3             | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | > 4             | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 7 | • Tariff objectives  
• Comprehensiveness of analysis  
• Periodicity of revision | A | 0-1 | L |
|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | 3               | H               |
| Regulatory Authority 8 | • Public consultations during tariff revision  
• Requirement for public consultation  
• Quality of public consultation process  
• Inclusiveness of public consultations  
• Publication of public comments and response | P | 0-1 | L |
<p>|           |                                                        |                   | 2               | M               |
|           |                                                        |                   | &gt; 2             | H               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Authority 9</th>
<th>Appeals process</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of appeals process</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate body at arm’s length</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions of the appellate are publicly available</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Authority 10</th>
<th>Publication of performance information by regulated entities</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication of price and standards of service</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for performance reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for financial reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public comments on reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance redressal</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Authority 11</th>
<th>Performance reporting by the regulator</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement to prepare annual work plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement to submit an annual report</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness of reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative review of performance of the regulator</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 1 – Mandate and Capacity of the Policy-making Body

Relevance of the Indicator:
There will be various legislative bodies that will be engaged in some form of policy-making that has relevance for urban transport. In some cases, the entire legislative body will be involved in the determination of the policy while often there will be a smaller committee that focuses on aspects related to urban development, transport or urban transport in particular. The draft proposal/bill/policy may be crafted by either a legislative member or by the executive arm of (that tier of) Government and placed before the legislative body for approval, and which may, in the course of deliberations, be modified (or asked to be reconsidered for modification, through a process of amendments) before final sanction by the body. Urban transport (or transport in general) may suffer from being a familiar subject and hence prone to a lack of technical consideration by policy-makers. Also, policy-making in the sector is often fragmented, with policy decisions being made at every tier of Government. Given these, it is important that the mandate that each body has with respect to urban transport be clearly defined and known to the policy makers and public. In the case of committees, the choice of members and the duration of their association with this committee will have an impact on the quality of deliberations that the draft policy will receive.

Guidance for Assessment:
Undertake the assessment for all the "policy-making" bodies identified in the urban transport mapping exercise. The mandate for the policy-making body will have to be determined from the relevant Act/s and procedures/rules relevant to that body and analyzed to extract the content that is relevant to urban transport issues (since the body may well consider more general policy matters). For the policy-making body, also determine the composition and whether this involves selection of a sub-group of legislators. If so the manner in which this is done will have to be determined. This may be formally documented or be a matter of practice. (Note: The ‘accountability’ buck stops at the legislative body, presumably chosen through a democratic/statutory process. Hence no assessment can be done of the quality or accountability of the members of legislative bodies, or at least within the purview of transport governance). Tenure would also be applicable only in case of a sub-committee (and not in case the entire legislative body is involved). The ability of this body to access information may also be formally specified in rules or more likely to be a matter of practice. Absence of or poor quality of information and/or data should be considered as lack of access to knowledge. In addition to study of documents, interviews with legislative members and support staff will help to ascertain the facts. The assessment team should consider several recent policy decisions taken by the body to arrive at a conclusion about this element.

Elements of Quality:
- **Clear mandate**: The policy-making body has a well-defined mandate to create policy regarding some aspect of urban transport
- **Selection of members**: The members to this body are selected with regards to their background and/or experience especially related to the elements of urban transport and conflicts of interest are avoided
- **Tenure of members**: The members on this body have a tenure that is defined and long enough for them to develop an understanding of the subject
- **Access to knowledge**: The members of the body have opportunities for enhancement of their own knowledge and access to information, either in the form of documents, or expertise and ability to get information through the conducting of surveys or studies to help policy formulation

Policy 2 – Effective Functioning of the Policy-making Body

Relevance of the Indicator:
Urban transport policy needs to keep pace with the fast-changing conditions in cities and new technologies that emerge on the market. Absence of an appropriate policy regime can lead to uncertain outcomes which, more often than not, create legal, social and environmental problems. The manner in which the body deliberates on policy matters will have an impact on the quality of the policy itself. Since urban transport policy is often fragmented, each body should ideally be cognizant of the connections of the policy under consideration with other policies and thus display integrated thinking on the subject. The setting of the agenda is a starting point for this to happen and investigation of the agenda will provide insights into the manner in which the body functions. Good policy should have clarity on what is expected as an outcome and the manner in which the policy will get implemented.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team should make a list of at least five major policies in existence that have been made by the body under consideration. New processes or new institutions created or major changes in existing ones should be noted. The timeline for when the policy formulation/reform process began (which may be a Government directive or official statement about the need to undertake reforms or a report submitted by a Government appointed agency which proposes reforms) and when the process was completed should be created. In case of policy revision, the timeline of policy update should be created which will reveal the frequency with which reforms take place. Additionally, the reforms themselves should be analyzed and an assessment made as to whether the changes were substantial or just minor modifications. For the chosen body, the assessment team will have to do a comprehensive review of the minutes of meetings over a period of time (at least one year) and establish the manner in which the agenda is set, the number of meetings, and quality and comprehensiveness of discussions while framing policy. For a few policy decisions an assessment should be made as to whether the outcomes of the policy and the manner in which the policy will be implemented is well-defined. Additionally, it would be useful to talk to some members of the policy group (not necessarily current members) and also officials.

Elements of Quality:
- **Frequency of policy reform**: Most major policies or policy frameworks are reviewed and/or revised at least once in a decade
- **Comprehensiveness of reforms**: New policy or policy reform leads to a substantial and comprehensive change in the policy framework, with new or innovative concepts introduced, which reflect the changes in the urban scenarios
- **Policy process timeframe**: The total time taken from the initiation of or reform process to the finalization of the policy is reasonable and rational
- **Setting of the agenda**: The agenda for consideration by the body is clear and in consonance with the overall mandate of the body
- **Conduct of meetings**: The body meets regularly and is able to assign enough time for discussions and consideration of various inputs in order to decide upon policy matters
- **Holistic policy consideration**: The body while making policy pays specific attention to all aspects of a transport system, namely accessibility, safety, equity, efficiency and environmental and social aspects
- **Integration with other policy**: The body while deliberating on policy matters within its jurisdiction/mandate considers the implications of other policies on it, as well as the impact of the policy under consideration upon those other policies
- **Setting policy outcomes**: The body while making the policy sets clear goals and defines indicators that will help assess the extent to which the policy has been successfully implemented
- **Implementation of policy**: The body while deciding upon any policy matter considers the manner in which the policy will be implemented, both in terms of clear ownership of each element of the policy as well as the capacity and institutional structure of each body that will be responsible for its implementation
Policy 3 – Transparency in the Working of the Policy-making Body

Relevance of the Indicator:
The making of new policy or revision of existing policy is usually due to some form of externality which initiates and in some cases, influences the outcome. Availability of information about why a policy is being made or an existing policy is being reformed creates clarity about the motivation and sets expectations about what the policy is supposed to achieve. Any conditions tied to international funding should be open to public scrutiny, to ensure that these are not inimical to the larger public good. During policy-making, the policy documents undergo changes based on the deliberations and inputs received by the policy-makers. It is important that the public know about the draft policy and the iterations that it goes through and the basis on which those changes are proposed. This will reduce the possibility of changes to policy based on either flawed reasoning or due to influence of vested interests. Transparency in the process also creates an opportunity for people to petition policy-makers in cases where such changes are not deemed to be beneficial and be better prepared during any formal consultation process.

Guidance for Assessment:
For at least a couple of policy formulations undertaken in the recent past, or else major policy decisions, including one that involves an external driver, the official background for the policy reform should be obtained and analyzed. This may include an evaluation of a previous policy or new data/analysis that has been published. In case of external agencies that may be responsible for the policy reform, the documents published by that external agency and when it was made public in comparison to when the policy reform occurred should be noted. The assessment team should consider minutes of the meetings of the policy body for a period of at least one year. Attention should be paid to the quality of the minutes, both in terms of comprehensiveness and clarity. The accessibility should be determined either on the basis of their availability on a website, or by requesting the minutes through communication like emails, phones or letters. There should be information easily available as to whom this request can be made to and the ease with which the information is obtained. Additionally, it should be possible to access specific minutes from the past or on a topic related to a certain policy discussion. Similarly, other documents (surveys, reports etc.) should also be available. If the assessment team has to resort to a formal process under the relevant Freedom of Information/Right to Information Act, then this should be noted.

(This indicator would also be applicable to any advisory group engaged by the planning body).

Elements of Quality:

- Background for policy or policy reform: The necessity for initiation of new policy or policy reform is stated and supported by data and analysis which clearly establishes a public need. This is also reflected in the policy outcomes.
- Availability in the public domain of external requirements: In the case where policy reform is linked to an external requirement such as foreign funding or international agreement/s, the conditions attached with these are available in the public domain at the time when policy is made or reformed.
- Meeting schedule and agenda publicly available: The planned schedule of meetings and its agenda are publicly available.
- Minutes of meetings: The deliberations of the body, including submissions made or hearings conducted by the body, are captured in minutes of meetings, which are comprehensive and made available to the public in a timely manner.
- Record keeping: Minutes and other documents used by the body are publicly available and kept in a manner that makes them easy to search and analyze and are available easily for long periods of time (archived).

Policy 4 – Public Participation in Policy-making

Relevance of the Indicator:
A key element of good governance, the ability of people to engage in the policy-making process is crucial to policy that is better informed and hence more likely to succeed. Given the complexity of urban transport and the wide array of stakeholders, no representative body can be realistically expected to be aware of the myriad of considerations that need to be considered. Public consultations not only allow such a diversity of inputs to feed into the policy-making process, but also benefits from the wealth of experience that any society possesses and which can strengthen the policy.

Guidance for Assessment:
The Act or Rules of Business under which the policy-making body functions would need to be analyzed to ascertain if there is a formal provision for public consultations during the policy-making process and whether this is set out in a detailed manner. The participatory process should be noted. For at least a couple of policy formulation events the actual manner in which the public consultation process was undertaken should be documented, including the type and quality of the information that was made available to the people. This information can be requested from the relevant office and can be substantiated with interviews of people who took part in the consultation process. A review of the participants and how they were invited to participate, will also reveal the spectrum of people that took part in the process and whether weaker sections of society, especially those affected by the policy were meaningfully involved. The support structure available for participatory processes, such as experienced staff, toolkits/guidelines for carrying out consultations and resources allocated for such processes should also be identified to help assess the capacity of the policy-making body to be able to conduct quality consultations.

(This indicator would also be applicable to any advisory group engaged by the planning body).

Elements of Quality:

- Requirement for public engagement: The policy-making body is required to subject policy decisions to public consultations.
- Clarity of public participation process: The process of public participation is well defined and is conveyed to the public. The process defines each stage of public consultations, the timeline for each stage, the methods of participation and the way the inputs from the public will be processed (including methods of conflict resolution) and communicated/made available to the public.
- Quality of participatory methods: The public consultation methods are of a high quality and meaningful. The way inputs are sought from the public are based on provision of information (publication of the draft policy and supporting documentation, for instance) to the public in such a manner that makes public participation “informed”. The inputs from people are sought at appropriate stages in the process so that they can inform the policy.
- Inclusiveness of the participatory process: The policy-making body indicates the necessity for participation by marginalized sections of society or those likely to be directly or significantly impacted by the policy and makes specific provisions in the public consultation process for this to be achieved.
- Capacity for participatory consultations: The policy-making body is supported by staff with experience in consultative processes and possesses resources for undertaking public consultations.
Planning

Planning 1 – Planning Mandate

Relevance of the Indicator:
Within the policy framework, each implementing agency that is entrusted with the task of implementing the whole or parts of the policy, must ideally prepare a plan of action that details the manner in which the policy objectives are to be met, without which either policy doesn’t translate into action or does so in a piecemeal and ad hoc manner. Such plans once prepared must also be implemented in a time-bound manner.

Guidance for Assessment:
Plans will be prepared by a variety of bodies, some of which may not be easily identified as planning agencies. In some cases, the executing authority itself will be responsible for some parts of the planning. The plan in reference here is a transport plan, to be differentiated from an executing authority’s strategy/annual plan. The plan itself may be an infrastructure plan or a plan to phase in a new technology or a new system – as envisaged and proposed in a policy formulation. The genesis of the plan is therefore, a policy formulation and the assessment team will have to determine if the policy/law/Act specifies the creation of such a plan of action, the agency that will prepare the plan, the plan period and what the plan must contain. It may be that a transport plan is not backed by any statute or a policy and is/was made as a stand-alone exercise or as a matter of practice. Such plans would fail to meet the first element of quality. The transport plan will be implemented by either one or more executive agencies, these will have to be enumerated along with the parts of the plan for which they are responsible. Whether the mandate of that executing authority in particular or a more general government policy/directive specifies a statutory manner in which that plan is to be implemented will need to be ascertained. In addition to a review of policy documents, interviews with key members of the planning agency, the period of implementation review, and the manner in which the progress of the plan implementation is reported.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement to prepare an implementation plan: There is a specific requirement to prepare an implementation plan. The scope, plan period and structure of the plan are well defined.
- Requirement to implement the plan: There is a statutory requirement to implement the plan with guidelines as to how this is to be done.
- Clearly defined monitoring mechanism: There is a well-defined process specified for the monitoring of the plan implementation with the monitoring agency, the period of implementation review, and the manner in which the progress of the plan implementation is reported.

Planning 2 – Capacity of the Planning Agency

Relevance of the Indicator:
Transport planning (sometimes integrated with land use plans) is a highly technical activity and will best be made by competent planning agencies. Often government bodies will engage specialized consultants for this purpose, but even so the planning body must have the requisite knowledge and experience to define the studies, guide their preparation and evaluate the final outputs. This is possible only if the planning body has the requisite capacity to perform this task.

Guidance for Assessment:
Assessment team must analyze the relevant documents related to the members of the planning agency as well as any guidelines issued by government for the staffing of such agencies (which may depend on the size of the city in question, population etc.). The manner in which the appointments were made will also reveal information about the qualifications sought. The overall composition of the planning body, strength, positions and requisite qualifications should be noted. Balanced composition will require that there is a variety of skill sets in the team. The tenure of the members, as defined in the staffing policy, should also be compared against actual tenure of the past members. In addition to the technical (planning) staff members, the supporting staff should also be noted. The resources available to the planning agency will require a visit to the planning agency office and interviews of key members. The significant data that it has in its possession – such as maps, surveys and various data, the manner in which this data is collected and maintained should be documented. The number and type of surveys that the agency has conducted in the last two years and the manner in which these were financed will yield information about the agencies authority and ability to get these done. In the absence of a planning agency altogether none of the elements of quality will be considered to have been met.

Elements of Quality
- Qualification of planning members: The planning agency has staff that is both individually qualified and collectively balanced to make competent plans.
- Tenure of members: The members of the planning agency have a tenure that is long enough for them to gain experience and expertise.
- Access to data: The planning agency has access to data and can undertake surveys and conduct such studies as it may require as inputs to preparing a plan.
- Autonomy and access to resources: The agency has the independence, authority and financial resources to acquire data, planning tools and other such resources as required to prepare quality plans.

...
Planning 3 – Effective Planning

Relevance of the Indicator:
The quality of the plans prepared will depend on the robustness of the planning process. Making sure that planning is integrated, not just with other transport plans/systems, but also with sectors connected to transport, such as land use plans, is crucial and must be defined as part of the planning process.

Guidance for Assessment:
Documents which guide the planning process (which may be statutory in nature or recommendatory) will allow the assessment team to determine the clarity of the planning process. An analysis of at least two plans prepared by the planning body will reveal other elements of the planning process quality. This indicator would also be applicable to any consultant engaged by the planning body.

Elements of Quality
- Clearly defined planning process: The planning agency has a well-defined process for preparing/updating plans. Stages in the process, such as data collection, review of previous studies, setting targets and identifying strategies based on various analyses, are defined. Intermediate outputs at each planning stage are also specified.
- Comprehensiveness of planning: The agency while making plans pays specific attention to all aspects of a transport system, namely accessibility, safety, equity, efficiency and environmental and social aspects.
- Integration with policy and other plans: The planning agency explicitly ensures that the plan achieves the objectives set by the policy framework. In case there are multiple plans related to urban transport made either by the same agency or any others, then integration with these other plans (vertical and horizontal integration) is specifically considered.
- Defining plan outcomes: The agency while making the plan clearly sets the expected outcomes and defines indicators that will help assess the extent to which the plan has been implemented and is deemed successful.
- Consideration for plan implementation: The planning agency considers institutional capacities, legal frameworks and financial resources of the implementing agencies and includes recommendations to ensure that the plan is implementable.

Planning 4 – Transparency in the Working of the Planning Agency

Relevance of the Indicator:
Planning usually happens in various stages, with intermediate draft documents as outputs from those stages. Transport plans also require inputs such as surveys, or component plans (for e.g. a bicycle plan) which are used or incorporated into these planning documents. It is important that each of these inputs should be publicly available as well as the planning standards/norms/guidelines that are used by the planning agency. This allows public scrutiny of all the inputs to the plan and allows people to ascertain if these have been used properly. Any changes that happen in the planning stages must also be publicly shared so that changes due to vested interest or which are not in public interest can be flagged.

Guidance for Assessment:
For at least two recent plans prepared by the planning agency, the completeness of public availability of the plan documents should be determined. The availability should be noted in terms of where and how (physical availability in the office of the planning body, availability upon request, formal process for procurement, available on website etc.) the documents are available to the public. Previous plans, indexed as per their formation dates or availability by specification (date of plan or type of document etc.) will reveal the quality of record keeping. Any rules or process published by the planning agency regarding record keeping should also be looked at and be used as part of the assessment. In case there is a transparency law in operation, then assessment should be done against the statutory requirements. This indicator would also be applicable to any consultant engaged by the planning body.

Elements of Quality
- Public disclosure of draft plan documents and planning guidelines: The outputs at various stages of the planning process, including intermediate or draft plans and revisions, are publicly available. Documents, planning guidelines, data, methodologies and norms used by the planning agency as inputs are also available for public scrutiny.
- Quality of record keeping: Documents used by the body are kept in a manner that makes them easy to search and analyze and are available easily for long periods of time (archived).
Planning 5 – Public Participation in Planning

Relevance of the Indicator:
Transport plans, like policy, will also benefit from processes that allow for public consultations. Furthermore, plans often require trade-offs between public and private interests (or even public-public and private-private interests). Resolution of conflicts that arise from these trade-offs are most easily addressed by giving an opportunity for stakeholders to be heard during the planning process. Participation also ensures (and it must be sometimes required) that the voices of weaker/lay persons are also heard, thus bringing balance to the overall plan.

Guidance for Assessment:
The requirement for the planning agency to conduct public consultations will be found either in the policy documents or internal process documents of the planning agency. These will define the manner in which the consultations are to be conducted, the number of times and stages when people are consulted. For at least two recent planning exercises, the actual process documentation should be reviewed. Interviews of key planners who were involved in the process as well as some of the participants will also help to ascertain the facts. The participants in the processes should be catalogued and analyzed for determining the breadth of participation, with an emphasis on weaker or marginalized sections. The process followed and interviews will also reveal if the planning body undertook any special efforts to ensure quality of participation. This indicator would also be applicable to any consultant engaged by the planning body.

Elements of Quality

- Requirement for public engagement: The planning agency is required at various stages to conduct public consultations
- Clarity of public participation process: The process of public participation is well defined and is conveyed to the public. The process defines each stage of public consultations, the timeline for each stage, the methods of participation and the manner in which the inputs from the public will be processed (including methods of conflict resolution) and communicated/made available to the public
- Quality of participatory methods: The public consultation methods are of high quality and meaningful. The manner in which inputs are sought from the public are based on provision of information to the public in such a manner that makes public participation “informed”. The inputs from people are sought at appropriate stages in the process such that they can influence the outcome of the policy
- Inclusiveness of the participatory process: The planning agency indicates the necessity for participation by marginalized sections of society or those likely to be directly or significantly impacted by the plan and makes specific provisions in the public consultation process for this to be achieved
- Capacity for participatory consultations: The planning agency is supported by staff with experience in consultative processes and possesses resources for undertaking public consultations

Planning 6 – Legislative Review of Plans

Relevance of the Indicator:
Planning agencies are usually technical bodies. Even though the planning process may be transparent and may have given opportunity for people to participate in the process, final sanction to the plan which would then make it statutory, would typically require legislative review and approval. There is an inherent dilemma in such legislative review and the scope of changes that can be made in this stage. While the legislative review process lends legitimacy to the plan and also allows broader political considerations to be addressed, it can also lead to capture by vested interests or changes that are technically unviable. The quality of the legislative review process is therefore an important consideration.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team will have to first identify both, the manner in which plans are sanctioned, and by which legislative body. In case plans are reviewed and sanctioned by an executing authority (like a Ministry) this should be noted. However the assessment can still be done with appropriate modification of the elements of quality. For at least two recent plans, the documents related to the review process should be examined. The time spent on the review, issues raised, modifications suggested and the nature of the review (specifics or related to policy-level matters) should be noted.

Elements of Quality

- Mandate of legislative review: The review process is well-defined (including time limits for completion of the review process) and the nature and scope of the review are also specified
- Transparency of review process: Both the plan documents and the recommendations of the legislative committee are available to the public
- Reasoned review: The recommendations of the review committee are supported by reasoned statements. They are also consistent with the stated policy. Where essential, they are substantiated by the planning agency
Planning 7 – Capacity of Legislative Committee for Review of Plans

Relevance of the Indicator:
As stated earlier legislative review of plans is an important step that lends political legitimacy to a technical document. However, while doing so the legislative body/committee charged with the review and sanction of the plan should have the requisite capacity to undertake this exercise. Urban transport plans are increasingly highly technical in nature, and therefore the ability of the legislative body to be able to meaningfully assess, and if necessary make changes to the plan, becomes an important aspect for assessment.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the same set of plans considered in the earlier indicator (Planning 6) the assessment team should document the members of the legislative committee and their qualifications and experience with regards to urban transport. If any qualifications are specified for the selection of members to the committee then those should also be noted. The assessment team should try and find out if committee members had access to simplified plan documents that enabled potentially non-technical members to be able to understand and assess the plan. It should also be found out if the committee has powers to call upon technical experts, including members of the planning team, to get information about the plan and for answers to any queries and if they actually exercised that power.

Elements of Quality

- **Composition of legislative committee:** If the legislative review of a plan is done by a sub-committee, then members of the committee are selected with regards to their background and/or experience and conflicts of interest are avoided
- **Access to data:** The legislative committee has access to information regarding the plan in simple formats. Information may be in the form of executive summary, clearly articulated benefits, costs, alternatives etc. Information ought to be available in local language if desired
- **Authority:** The legislative committee is empowered and uses the authority to call technical experts to answer questions and seek clarifications

Planning 8 – Public Participation in the Legislative Review

Relevance of the Indicator:
While legislative review of plans before final sanction is important, it can also be an opportunity for vested interests to manipulate the plans for their benefit. A requirement for public participation in this process, which allows a wide segment of society to provide inputs and for the process to be transparent will not only prevent capture of the process by more powerful and connected parties, but also allow legislators to get inputs from people on the basis of which decisions about the plan can be made.

Guidance for Assessment:
The requirement for seeking public inputs during the legislative review of plans should be checked by the assessment team, typically in the Act/statute that guides this process. Public inputs may also be sought as part of the standard practice followed and this may also be noted. The manner in which inputs are sought and how this is communicated to the public should be documented. The information that is available to people, such as any proposed changes to the plan and the reasons therefore, will be useful. For the plan under consideration the relevant documents should be reviewed and the public inputs actually received should be analyzed. Particular attention should be paid to deciding if the inputs received are from a broad spectrum of stakeholders. The availability of documents on this process will also determine the transparency of the process.

Elements of Quality

- **Requirement for seeking public inputs:** The statutory process of legislative review of plans has a requirement for public inputs. In case of multiple stages of review all stages must have a public participation requirement
- **Quality and inclusiveness of the process for seeking public inputs:** The public participation methods provide ample opportunity for people to comment upon proposed changes to the plan under review and information is available for people to provide meaningful inputs. The process also allows for wide participation
- **Transparency of the public inputs process:** The inputs received from everyone is publicly and easily available, such as upon request or published on a website or in some public manner
Planning 9 – Engagement of Consultants/Advisory Groups

Relevance of the Indicator:
Various public authorities (policy-making bodies, planning agencies, standards’ organizations, executive or regulatory bodies etc.) may engage consultants (either on a paid basis or pro bono) or set-up advisory committees to undertake certain specific tasks such as preparing draft policy, detailed project reports, technical assessments, preparing toolkits and templates (such as for Environment Impact Assessments, “model concessionaire agreements” etc.), undertake studies, conduct surveys, audits or public consultations etc. and use these as inputs into their own work. While public authorities are usually subject to checks and bounds, the use of consultants/advisory groups may not be. As these may end up doing a substantial portion of the work, it is important that they also be subject to the same levels of scrutiny and accountability as the public authority that engages them. The manner in which the consultants/advisory members are chosen and the terms of their engagement is therefore an important aspect the quality of which is captured by this indicator.

Guidance for Assessment:
For various types of bodies (for the assessment scope under consideration), the use of consultants should be investigated. The assessment team should decide if a particular consultant engagement is “typical”, else multiple consultant engagements will have to be considered. Engagement by different types of bodies should be considered separately, as each will have procedural differences in the way they engage consultants. The documents related to the engagement such as Expression of Interest (EoI), Request for Proposal (RFP) will need to be examined. The actual process for selection should be documented. This may be substantiated further by conducting interviews of officials.

Elements of Quality

- **Criteria for selection of consultants/advisory group members**: The criteria for the selection of a consultant or advisory group members are specified and ensures expertise and balance in the composition of the team
- **Terms of reference of the consultant/advisory group**: The mandate, expected deliverables, process and timeline for the consultant/advisory group are well-defined and provide adequate discretion and resources for it to be able to perform its task
- **Transparency in engagement**: The criteria for selection, terms of reference and inputs provided to the consultant/advisory group are publicly available during the process of engagement and also available later
- **Managing conflict of interest**: There are provisions in the selection criteria that specifically ensure that there is no conflict of interest with regards to the consultant or advisory committee members, or there is a requirement for declaration of any potential conflicts and rules are specified for resolving any conflicts that arise
Standards

Standards 1 – Mandate of Standards’ Organizations

Relevance of the Indicator:
There typically exist various standards and design guidelines that have to be adhered to during project design and implementation (such as street design guidelines, engineering specifications) or met by service delivery systems. There are also norms (such as pollution, safety etc.) that have to be met at the system-level. Such standards will normally be created by technical committees and/or organizations that are dedicated to development of such standards. Deciding on standards involves careful consideration of their impacts and the trade-offs (such as cost of implementation and safety). Industry, contractors and service providers will be affected and will be important stakeholders in the process of their formulation or revision. Ensuring that there is a right balance between technical considerations, business interests and public interest requires that the standards’ organizations have a well-defined mandate, the right technical composition and that there is no conflict of interest in its functioning.

Guidance for Assessment:
The first step here would be to list the various urban transport standards (irrespective of whether they are actually being implemented) and identify the standards’ specification documents and the organizations that created them. For each body, the statute under which it was created will need to be studied. There may also be government decrees/orders that give statutory powers to these standards’ organization. Any Court rulings may also be noted, though this may not be considered to satisfy the requisite element of quality. Staff on each body and the manner in which they are selected and the process of appointments would have to be assessed. Interviews with organization officials/members will help to ascertain the manner in which the body operates, the ability to call experts/stakeholders and the overall capacity of the body (technical and other resources). An analysis of the organization budget (two years) will also reveal critical information about the capacity.

Elements of Quality

- **Mandate of the standards’ organizations:** The organizations responsible for creating standards and deciding various norms are statutory bodies and their functioning and the standards they create are enforceable by law
- **Composition of staff:** There are well-defined criteria for the appointment of members of standards’ organizations and result in a balanced composition of the body
- **Rules for managing conflict of interests:** There exist rules to ensure that there is no conflict of interest for any of the members of the organization and requirement for disclosure of any links to the industry
- **Authority:** The standards’ organization has the authority and financial resources to call relevant experts and seek inputs as required
- **Access to information:** Standards’ organizations have access to relevant information and data, surveys and other technical resources in order to be able to function effectively and make informed decisions

Standards 2 – Functioning of Standards’ Organizations

Relevance of the Indicator:
In the fast evolving urban transport sector, it is important that existing standards are reviewed and revised and new ones created as and when the need arises. While lack of or outdated standards can create a problem, poorly conceived and conflicting standards can also be problematic. Making sure that the expected outcomes from the standards under consideration (for e.g. improvement in safety, increase in accessibility, etc.) are specified and that the process is transparent and crucial to getting quality results.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team should examine documents (minutes of meetings, experts called, submissions made by various groups, any surveys/studies commissioned by the organization etc.) for the past two standards published/updated by the organization. The number of meetings and attendance by members should also be noted. The notes accompanying the standards – essentially justifying the choices made by the committee members will reveal information that will help to assess the relevant element of quality. Interviews of key members of the organization (including past members) will also be important.

Elements of Quality

- **Active organization:** The standards’ organization meets regularly in order to create new standards and review and update existing ones
- **Justification of standards:** Standards proposed by the committee are required to be substantiated on the basis of the expected outcomes, specifically with regards to elements of transport, namely accessibility, safety, equity, efficiency and environmental and social aspects
- **Transparency in the functioning of the organization:** Minutes of meetings are required to be recorded and made publicly available
Standards 3 – Stakeholder Consultations in Standards Setting

Relevance of the Indicator:
While the standards setting body is typically a technically competent body, nonetheless it is crucial that it should conduct consultations with stakeholders while setting/defining standards. As noted earlier, deciding on standards involves careful consideration of their impacts and the trade-offs (such as cost of implementation and safety). Industry, contractors and service providers will be affected and will be important stakeholders in the process of their formulation or revision. Ensuring that there is a right balance between technical considerations, business interests and public interest requires that the standards’ organizations should not only have a requirement for stakeholder consultations, but also that this should be fair, transparent and inclusive to avoid capture of the process by vested interests.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the standards (being formulated or revised) under consideration, the manner in which stakeholder consultations took place should be analyzed, starting with the statutory requirements for such consultations in the first place. The actual process of stakeholder consultations should be reviewed, which would include the manner in which stakeholders are invited, and whether attention is paid to ensuring that opinions are sought from across the spectrum. The list of stakeholders who gave their inputs should be looked at, which would provide information about whether the process was fair and balanced. Ideally industry, civil society and public interests should be represented fairly. Whether publication of draft standards was required or carried out as a matter of practice should be noted, the manner in which this was done and whether inputs from the public at-large are sought will enable the assessment team to determine the elements of quality for this indicator.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for stakeholder consultations: The standards’ organization is required by statute or as a matter of policy and practice to undertake stakeholder consultation
- Inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process: Stakeholder consultations are balanced and fair and all points of view are sought
- Publication for review: Draft standards are required to be published by statute, or as a matter of policy and practice, for seeking comments from the public

Standards 4 – Enforcement of Standards

Relevance of the Indicator:
It is not uncommon for various standards to exist but not be implemented. While compliance with standards is the responsibility of the executing agency, it is also important that mechanisms exist that ensure communication of changes in standards along with public notifications, so that agencies are also aware of any changes that have been made. Since standards are made by technical bodies they can also play a role in defining the capacities needed for executing bodies to be able to implement standards.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the standards published by the organization, the manner in which they were notified and the various communications with the relevant Ministries as well as the actions taken by the Ministries will be the basis for determining these elements of quality. The statute/s that govern the body or others which govern the concerned Ministry will help to determine any required process to be followed when standards are published. The assessment team should also interview some key officials of executive bodies (such as a state or municipal road dept., or public transport company etc.) who would ultimately use these standards to understand how they take cognizance of updated standards. Some contractors may also be interviewed to understand if and how standards are communicated to their level.

Elements of Quality
- Publication of standards: All new standards or updates to existing ones are required to be effectively publicized and communicated through specified channels to executive bodies
- Advisories on implementation of standards: The standards’ organizations, along with the standards, are required to publish an advisory note on the manner in which the standards are to be implemented and resources/staff skills required by the executive bodies
Executing Authority

Executing Authority 1 – Staffing Policies and Capacity of the Executing Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
Implementing urban transport schemes and projects, traffic regulation and enforcement or running transport services are typical responsibilities of executive agencies and require an experienced and well-balanced staff, with the need to draw upon a wide skill set, both technical and managerial. Given the changes in the urban transport sector, it is also likely that new positions are required to be created within the organization to be able to fulfill all the responsibilities assigned to it. With the emergence of new technologies, materials and techniques, it is also important for the organization to keep enhancing its skills to be able to deliver quality results.

Guidance for Assessment:
Urban transport projects and schemes will be planned and executed by an executing agency. Typically, these will be departments within a larger public authority, like a road department within a municipal body or an infrastructure development agency (which may be responsible for a variety of infrastructure projects, including urban transport projects), a police department or even a services agency, such as a public transport service provider, which also executes projects. For the bodies selected, the statutes or standard government processes followed for staffing will have to be examined. The actual process followed for some recent appointments will also help to reveal information about the process. For senior staff, the tenure should be noted as well cases where staff member was removed/transferred and the manner in which this was carried out. The assessment team will also have to look into the manner in which non-senior staff positions are decided (type of position and number of positions) and the control the department has in this matter. There may be fairly elaborate staffing procedures determined by other arms of the government, in which case, these would also have to be assessed. The overall structure and staff profiles should be analyzed to understand the breadth of composition. The assessment team should make a judgement about the element of quality based on whether various functions of the executive are handled by staff that have requisite qualifications and experience. In addition to the departmental policy, the assessment team should also catalog for a period of two years the staff members and the type of training they underwent. Especially important to note is whether training is decided based on skill levels that are expected to be achieved, or in an ad hoc manner. Interview of executing authority head is expected to be conducted.

Elements of Quality
- **Clear criteria for appointment of senior staff**: There are clear and transparent criteria and a well-defined process for the appointment of senior staff
- **Tenure of staff**: There is a specified tenure for the staff and well laid down processes and criteria for removal/transfer before the end of tenure
- **Authority to appoint departmental staff**: The executive agency is able to recruit staff with requisite qualifications for fulfillment of various needs of the department and there are well laid down guidelines for this
- **Composition of staff**: The staff of the executing authority has a wide variety of experience covering technical, financial, environmental, legal, managerial and soft skills
- **Requirement for skill-enhancement of staff**: Departmental policy specifies the need for training and skill-enhancement for staff across the entire organization and resources are allocated accordingly

Executing Authority 2 – Effective Functioning of the Executing Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
In order for there to be transparency and accountability in the functioning of the executing authorities responsible for urban transport (there may be several such bodies at every tier of government), there is a need for clarity in how these bodies plan and perform their functions and the coordination between them. This indicator captures this quality.

Guidance for Assessment:
Government statutes or Ministerial orders and notifications will reveal the mandate and function of the executing authority and list its functions. External or internal policy documents will ascertain the manner in which the body delivers services to the public and the manner in which people may make applications to avail of services. Citizen charters, including their existence, the manner in which they are written, their availability and whether they are up-to-date etc. will help assess this element of quality. For some of the key decisions taken by the executing authority, the manner in which public consultations were done – and the rules which govern that process – should be analyzed. Especially important for this indicator would be interviews of departmental staff as well as citizens who have interfaced with the department. Media articles on this matter will also serve as a source of information that will help to determine this indicator.

Elements of Quality
- **Clarity about mandate and function of executing authority**: The mandate and various functions (specific to urban transport) to be performed by the executing authority (ministry/department/sub-department etc.) are clearly stated and publicly available
- **Well-defined public interface**: The executing authority has a well-defined set of operational procedures to address public issues (citizens’ charters)
- **Effective public interface**: The executing authority responds to public service requests in a systematic manner and provides reasoned responses for decisions taken within well-defined time limit
- **Grievance redressal system**: The executing authority has a grievance redressal system in place, with well-defined time limits and an escalation procedure
- **Requirement for public consultations**: The executing authority has a policy regarding public consultations in execution of the various functions of the body
- **Transparency in functioning**: The executing authority publishes documents related to its functioning (strategy and annual plan, annual reports, citizens’ charters, operational guidelines, organizational information etc.) and this information is maintained, organized and indexed in a manner that facilitates ease of access and understanding (such as in local language)
- **Independent review and monitoring**: There is defined process for the independent review and monitoring of the executing agency, and these reviews are available in the public domain
Executing Authority 3 – Performance-based Incentives

Relevance of the Indicator:
In any executing authority performance based-incentives are a strong accountability measure and a powerful tool to improve the quality of the work being done and creating a positive work environment. The publication of quantitative performance reports can be a deterrent to favoritism, nepotism, corruption and undue administrative and political influence. It helps to create a work ethic that makes staff members accountable to the quality of service they deliver to the public, rather than to interest groups that can control their placements and promotions.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team will need to analyze the documents (policies, procedures, rules) related to departmental performance reviews. Out of these the public records as well as the ones which are actually publicly available should be noted. Staff members should be interviewed to find out the manner in which period performance reviews are conducted and what information is available/know to them. Senior staff/officials should also be asked to describe the manner in which they conduct the performance reviews and how information is provided to staff members. The promotions/demotions made in the last couple of years should also be analyzed to determine if there is a correlation between these and the performance reports. If possible clarifications for any discrepancies may be sought from the relevant officers.

Elements of Quality
- Performance metrics specified: Performance metrics and the review process are specified for all levels of staff and these are known to all staff members
- Transparent review process: Review of staff performance against the specified metrics takes place in a transparent manner and staff has access to reviews and explanatory notes as well as a mechanism to seek clarifications
- Performance review outcomes specified: The outcome of any review process, either in terms of promotions, incentives or grounds for action are specified and known to staff members
- Transparency of performance review process: The performance review reports and outcomes of the review process are publicly available

Executing Authority 4 – Reporting by the Executing Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
The executive bodies are responsible for the execution of various plans in a time bound manner and must essentially be held accountable on the basis of implementation of those plans. Periodic reports by the executive provides an objective method for evaluating the performance of the department (and can be linked to the performance of the staff) and will help in taking corrective action. Such public statements of what is planned to be achieved and what was achieved helps to avoid ad hoc activities, keeps the executing authority on track to achieve outcomes, can help to reduce political interference (as opposed to political oversight) and make the executive accountable to the public.

Guidance for Assessment:
The policy/rules should first be studied to determine requirements, if any, for making and publishing strategy plans, annual plans and annual reports as well as the process and guidelines for preparing them and their approval/sanction by the legislative or executive (Ministerial) body. If such plans have been prepared, they should be analyzed both in terms of process (the consultations that were conducted etc.) and the content to determine how comprehensive they are (whether they address all or most of the elements of a sustainable transport system) and whether they refer to internal processes. The manner in which legislative review has taken place for the previous strategy plan as well as last couple of annual plans/reports (the time taken, the review comments etc.) should be documented. Interviews with officials as well as members of the legislative body (present or past) will also help in the assessment.

Elements of Quality
- Publication of medium-term strategic plans: Executive bodies prepare and publish medium-term strategy plans (typically 5 years or coterminous with the tenure of the government) in-line with stated policy regarding urban transport
- Coordination with other executive agencies: The strategic plans outline complementary actions of other executive bodies as well as dependencies and the coordinating strategies
- Requirement for annual planning: The executing authority is required to prepare an annual plan of action, in consonance with the strategy plan, that outlays the targets for the following year in terms of outcomes, outputs and process improvements
- Requirement for annual reporting: It is required that executive bodies publish annual reports and the structure and content of the report is specified
- Comprehensiveness of reporting: The annual report must contain at a minimum, elements such as the overall as well as annual targets that were set and achievements against them. Status of project implementations should also be covered. The report must also contain reference to all the elements of the transport system, namely accessibility, safety, equity, efficiency and environmental and social aspects
- Reporting on process improvements: The executing authority reviews, identifies gaps and reports on the steps taken within the department to improve delivery, such as process reforms, staff enhancement, reduction of inefficiencies etc.
- Quality of legislative review of executive: The legislative review of the annual reports of the executive along with recommendations are conducted in a time-bound manner and these reports are publicly available
Executing Authority 5 – Capacity for Strategy and Planning

Relevance of the Indicator:
Urban transport planning requires planning and implementation of complex systems and projects, and while there may be technical/engineering expertise within departments involved with urban transport, the ability to have strategic planning is equally important. This indicator captures whether the executing authorities have the requisite capacity for strategy and planning so as to have a holistic and comprehensive approach to solving urban transport problems.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the executing authorities being assessed, it should be determined if there is a dedicated cell and/or personnel whose primary function is strategy and planning. If there is a requirement for such a cell, but it is not actually functional, this may be noted. The qualifications and experience of the staff with regards to planning should be documented. The types of training (courses, workshops, seminars etc.) and whether the staff has opportunities to attend these and have access to other means of skill assessment, such as planning tools and guides should also be found out. Interviews with staff members will help gather some of this information.

Elements of Quality

- **Existence of strategy and planning cell:** A dedicated planning cell or personnel for this function exists
- **Qualification of strategy and planning personnel:** Personnel involved in strategy and planning are educationally qualified and have experience in urban transport planning
- **Access to knowledge and skill enhancement:** The planning personnel undergo periodic training and have access to tools and materials that help enhance their planning skills

Executing Authority 6 – Project Selection

Relevance of the Indicator:
Urban transport projects (infrastructure or services) must ideally emerge from the policy/plan framework and serve to meet the ultimate objectives of the policy or the plan. Project selection depends on myriad factors and should be based on careful analysis. It is not an exact science and will involve many subjective judgements. Non-transparency and lack of a well-defined process in determining a project can thus be prone to influence by vested interests. Vendors, contractors and indeed consultants appointed for the preparation of various reports that would justify (or not) a project will all, without the proper safeguards tend to influence the selection process and must therefore be governed by a strict set of rules that ensures that people are informed and have access to the documents and decisions taken at all stages.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team will need to carry out a detailed analysis of a project selection process. For this, as always, the relevant Acts/policies/rules will have to be studied to understand the process and the various requirements. In addition, the rules followed by the specific executing authority, should also be documented. A representative sample of projects should be selected (type, cost) and the manner in which the particular projects were proposed and selected should be looked at. At least a couple of cases should be selected where a consultant was used to prepare the background studies that were instrumental in selection of the project. The rules in place for the use of consultants should be determined, paying specific attention to conflict of interest management. The general rules followed by the executing authority for publication of supporting documents, if not a part of the Act/policy/rules, can be determined either by noting the actual practice or through interviews of key officials.

Elements of Quality

- **Well-defined process for determination of the projects to be implemented:** Each executing authority that determines projects to be implemented has a well-defined process for project determination, including the decision-making stages, the specific studies required at each stage and the process for approval
- **Requirement to be part of the plan:** All project proposals must emerge from the underlying plan (or policy) rather than being ad hoc in nature. Non-plan projects are required to be justified
- **Requirement for alternatives analysis:** Before arriving at a specific solution, there is a requirement to conduct an alternatives analysis which considers various options and specifies a process for arriving at the chosen solution
- **Requirement for feasibility studies:** All projects above a certain magnitude (determined by cost, duration or potential impact) must be subjected to feasibility studies, such as (but not limited to) cost-benefit analysis
- **Managing consultant conflict of interests:** It is required that any consultants/persons appointed for conducting studies that will determine the choice of projects, such as alternatives analysis or feasibility studies, do not have a vested interest in the project
- **Transparency in project selection:** Studies conducted and supporting data/reports are publicly available prior to final project selection
- **Transparency in selection process:** Documents prepared and minutes of decision-making meetings are required to be made publicly available
- **Assessment against policy goals and metrics:** Final project selection decision-making process is subject to assessment against policy goals and/or metric published by the executing authority
Executing Authority 7 – Public Participation in Project Selection

Relevance of the Indicator:
In addition to the requirement that the executing authority should have a robust process for the selection of projects to be executed, it is also important that people should be involved in the project selection process to ensure that project selection is subject to public scrutiny and people’s priorities are taken into account. Alternatives analyses also require that people are consulted when options are considered and choices about the type of project/solution to be implemented is made. Public participation in the process also ensures that any vested interests in these decisions is minimized and that projects/solutions that benefit the maximum number of people are given a higher priority.

Guidance for Assessment:
The statutory requirements for public participation or requirement to gather public inputs during the project/solution selection phase should be gathered. For the projects being assessed, whether people were consulted when project selection was being finalized should be investigated. The manner in which the consultations take place and the actual inputs received should be analyzed. The list of participants will also reveal to the assessment team whether the process was inclusive. Senior officials from the executing authority may be interviewed to gather more information about the manner in which public participation happens. If possible some of the people who participated in the process or gave inputs should be interviewed.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for stakeholder consultations: There is a statutory requirement for consulting people during the project selection phase or this is done as a matter of policy or practice
- Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process: Ample opportunity is provided to people to be able to participate in the process, and they have access to information to be able to provide meaningful inputs. The process for participation is fair and allows for all sections of society to be able to participate

Executing Authority 8 – Project Specification

Relevance of the Indicator:
The detailed design of any project is an important intermediate step before it is contracted. Specifying the design and making it public constitutes a commitment to the manner in which the project will be executed and will serve as a critical accountability tool at later stages of the project implementation. Absence of detailed designs or designs that lack appropriate specificity can be problematic in the contracting stage and also allow for ad hoc changes to the design during implementation, which may be driven by contractor or vested interests.

Guidance for Assessment:
The executing authority should first be asked to furnish the templates or guidelines used to prepare detailed designs for the various types of projects implemented by them. The standard operating procedures should also be examined to determine how these templates/guidelines are to be used and if they are required to all or only a subset of projects and if those criteria are specified. The templates/guidelines themselves must be analyzed to decide the details that are required, including outcome specifications. For a representative sample of projects recently approved/being implemented/implemented, the detailed designs should be examined. Standard practice followed by the department for the publication of these designs (either on their own, or provided upon request) should be noted. For the sample of projects chosen, when these documents were published (at what stage of the project) should be determined.

Elements of Quality
- Specification of detailed project design documents: Each type of project implemented by an executing body has a detailed design template and relevant guidelines and standards
- Requirement to prepare detailed project reports: Each project, prior to implementation is required to be designed in detail
- Comprehensiveness of detailed project reports: In addition to technical details and engineering aspects, the detailed designs are also required to specify legal and financial issues, risk and risk management considerations, project overrun (cost and time) projections and provisions to deal with these scenarios and list compliances with various government guidelines and design standards, for that type of project
- Project time-line specification: All projects have detailed project implementation timelines, which specify intermediate milestones, including budget utilization and outcomes (if any)
- Project outcomes specification: All projects have outcome specifications with regards to all elements of transport systems, namely accessibility, safety, equity, efficiency and environmental and social aspects, benchmarked against policy goals and objectives
- Availability of project documents in public domain: All detailed project design documents (including drafts and public feedback, if any) along with expected outcomes from the project are available in the public domain prior to initialization of project implementation
Executing Authority 9 – Public Participation in Project Specification

Relevance of the Indicator:
In addition to the requirement that the executing authority should have a robust process for the specification of projects to be executed, it is also important that people should be involved in the project specification process to ensure that project specification is subject to public scrutiny and people’s requirements are taken into account. This is also the stage of the project where people are often most concerned, since project specifications are likely to affect them directly. Involving people also requires the executing authority to make project designs and specifications public and allows scrutiny of designs. People are also more likely to support projects that have been vetted by them. Special needs of certain people such as persons with disabilities, senior citizens, children etc. can also be incorporated and/or vetted at this stage and hence fulfillment of the elements of quality for this indicator are important.

Guidance for Assessment:
The statutory requirements for public participation or requirement to gather public inputs during the project/solution design phase should be gathered. For the projects being assessed, whether people were consulted when project design was being finalized should be investigated. The manner in which the consultations take place and the actual inputs received should be analyzed. The list of participants will also reveal to the assessment team whether the process was inclusive. Senior officials from the executing authority may be interviewed to gather more information about the manner in which public participation happens. If possible some of the people who participated in the process or gave inputs should be interviewed. In case a consultant was used for the project design/specification, then the terms of reference also reveal to the assessment team whether the process was inclusive. Senior officials from the executing authority may be interviewed to get insights into the manner in which consultations took place.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for stakeholder consultations: There is a statutory requirement for consulting people during the project specification phase or this is done as a matter of policy or practice
- Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process: Ample opportunity is provided to people to be able to participate in the process, and they have access to information to be able to provide meaningful inputs. The process for participation is fair and allows for all sections of society to be able to participate

Executing Authority 10 – Project Contracting Process

Relevance of the Indicator:
Contracting of projects is a complex but extremely critical component of project implementation. The quality of contracts will have a significant impact on the outcome of the project and the ability of the executing authority to control the quality of the project implementation. Poorly drafted contracts can lead to ad hoc interpretations of terms and conditions, make it difficult to monitor the quality of the project implementation and lead to disputes. Weak contracting processes can result in undue advantages to contractors, poor quality of implementation and cost and time escalation. The selection of the contractor who represents the best “value for money” is essential to keep down costs while ensuring appropriate capacity to implement projects. Vaguely defined contracting processes which allow for interference by executive or political persons increase the chances of corruption and erode public faith.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team will have to document in detail the entire contracting procedure, starting with the manner in which contract documents are prepared and the different procedures (or additional stages) used for different type of projects (for e.g. RFQs or RFPs or EoIs may be floated for certain kinds of projects, whereas tenders may be floated directly for some others) and the criteria used for determining this. The team should specifically note the manner and publicity that is given (or required to be given as per standard operating procedures) for the tenders, the conducting of pre-bid meetings, issuing of clarifications, extension of deadlines etc. Information about the bidding system (e-tendering or any other), the use of IT systems and conditions for access to tender and bid documents, will all help to determine the elements of quality. The process followed for actual evaluation of bids (including the use of technical-financial 2-bid-systems) and the criteria used for disallowing very low bids, minimum number of bids will also help to decide how fair, transparent and robust the contracting process is. Interviews of officials (including all those involved in the contracting chain – such as vigilance, accounts etc.) will be invaluable as will be interviews of contractors. Contracts canceled or revoked may also provide critical information for the completion of this indicator.

Elements of Quality
- Clarity on contracting process: The process for awarding contracts for projects is well-defined. Each stage of the contractual process is specified, along with the decision criteria at each stage and a clear assignment of who makes the decisions
- Transparency in preparing contracts: The process of preparation and finalization of contract documents (including expression of interest, request for proposals, tenders etc.) is documented and information is available in the public domain
- Transparency in contracting: At each stage in the contracting process, decisions are documented and these are available in the public domain
- Fair bidding procedures: All stages of the bidding are carried out in a fair and transparent manner (including pre-qualifications) and through a process that ensures the best possible value for money for the executing authority
- Provision of information to bidders: Bidders are provided with proper information, an opportunity for clarification and enough time to prepare and submit bids
- Safeguards against aggressive bidding: There are criteria specified that allow disallowing of bids that qualify as being overly aggressive. Criteria may be project specific such as for high risk, high value, long-term projects (for example mega projects)
Executing Authority 11 – Project Contract Execution

Relevance of the Indicator:
Once project contracts are awarded, the executing agency must follow robust processes for ensuring that contractual terms are satisfied. Contractors can take advantage of a lack of or poor enforcement of terms, while enforcing them selectively, without an objective and transparent process, provides opportunities for corruption.

Guidance for Assessment:
Once contracts are awarded, the process followed by the department until completion of the project, the various stages and criteria to determine each stage, will need to be documented in detail. In particular who does the monitoring, how this is recorded and reported and the chain of action taken should be documented by the assessment team. The criteria for legislative review should be noted and the process for this should also be documented. It will also be instructive for the team to actually analyze a representative sample of projects and examine the documents maintained by the department. Any discrepancies between the defined procedure and what happens in practice should be noted and if possible, explanations should be sought from the department officials.

Elements of Quality
- Well-defined process for monitoring: There exists a well-defined process for review of the project during its implementation/contractual period, with clarity on the roles and responsibilities of various officials
- Enforcement of contractual terms and conditions: In case of violation of the contractual terms there is a well-defined process for taking steps to require contractor to take corrective actions, impose penalties or cancellation of the contract. Roles and responsibilities of officials are clear
- Legislative review of executive actions: There is a well-defined process for legislative review of any actions to be taken by the executing authority, such as imposition of penalties, approval of cost-escalation or cancellation of contracts
- Transparency of legislative review actions: Any decisions taken by the legislative committee with regards to contracts are justified, documented and publicly available

Executing Authority 12 – Physical Audit of Projects

Relevance of the Indicator:
For projects, of a certain type and above a certain value, it may be necessary to carry out third-party audits. These physical audits are used to ensure compliance with various standards and help to assess the overall quality of the project. In addition to quality audits, safety and accessibility audits may be specified as being required. Physical audits of urban transport projects can significantly help to improve the quality of the projects and provide an opportunity for project quality improvement during the implementation stage.

Guidance for Assessment:
The rules or standard operating procedures regarding physical audits (one-time or conducting periodically), criteria for selection of projects that are subjected to them, the type of physical audits and the process to be followed for conducting them should be assessed. These may be part of statutory documents (laws, policies, rules) or may be part of departmental rules (internal). The assessment team should also catalog any such physical audits undertaken in the last couple of years. The executing authority may also be asked to furnish documents related to post-audit actions. The contractor involved should also be interviewed.

Elements of Quality
- Specification of audit criteria: There are clearly stated criteria for the type of projects that are subjected to physical audits prior to completion
- Clarity of audit process: The manner in which the audit is to be conducted, criteria for internal or third-party audits and terms of reference are specified
- Neutrality of audit agency: In case of internal audits, the audit team is sufficiently separated from the executing arm. In case of third-party audits, the agency is vetted against any conflict of interest
- Response of executive: The executive is required to consider the audit report and make recommendations to the contractor
- Compliance report by contractor: The contractor is required to submit a compliance report based on the recommendations made by the executive
Executing Authority 13 – Public Participation in Physical Audits

Relevance of the Indicator:
In addition to the requirement that projects of certain types and costs be subjected to physical audits, the involvement of people in this process will further enhance the quality of the audit. It also provides a formal opportunity for people to raise concerns and if done properly can help to increase public faith in the project.

Guidance for Assessment:
The statutory requirements for public participation or requirement to involve people during the project audit phase should be gathered. For the projects being assessed, whether people were involved when project audit was being conducted should be investigated. The manner in which people were involved and the inputs received should be analyzed. The list of participants will also reveal to the assessment team whether the process was inclusive. Senior officials from the executing authority may be interviewed to gather more information about the manner in which public involvement happens. If possible some of the people who participated in the process or gave inputs should be interviewed. In case a third-party was used for the audit, then the terms of reference of the agency employed and the requirement for public involvement should be studied. In addition to studying the reports, interviews of civil society organization members may be conducted to shed more light on the manner in which public inputs were sought.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for stakeholder consultations: There is a statutory requirement for consulting people during the project audit or this is done as a matter of policy or practice
- Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process: Ample opportunity is provided to people to be able to participate in the process, and they have access to information to be able to provide meaningful inputs. The process for participation is fair and allows for all sections of society to be able to participate

Executing Authority 14 – Transparency during Project Execution

Relevance of the Indicator:
Urban transport projects typically get implemented in the public domain and may require changes in the existing transport system. They can also cause hardship to people and may temporarily create environmental or safety hazards. Many such issues are required to be dealt with by the contractor and/or the relevant public authority. Information of projects being executed, including public advisories must be available in the public domain. Taking people into confidence can help improve public cooperation and also help create an effective monitoring agency.

Guidance for Assessment:
Rules regarding the posting of information about projects being implemented must be procured and studied. For a representative sample of projects, the department may be asked to furnish details of what kind of information was posted and in what manner. Any notices in the media or related press releases should also be gathered. If any projects are ongoing during the assessment period, then actual information about the projects, including the availability of a public grievance system and the manner in which it works should be documented.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for publication of project reports: Project documents, including audit reports, executing agency response to the audit and compliance reports are required to be publicly available and are easily accessible
- Project information publicly displayed: Project details (nature of work, contractor, budget, estimated duration etc.), including contact information of officer in-charge of public liaison, and public advisories (such as change in traffic patterns, change in services, safety advisories etc.) are publicly displayed
- Availability of public grievance redressal: The executing authority provides for a grievance redressal system to address issues faced by the public with regards to project implementation and information about this system is publicly displayed. Logs of this system are accessible
- Project implementation status published: The status of the project implementation (percentage of completion, budget utilization, impact assessments, mitigation, extensions, contract changes etc.) are publicly available
Impact of post-implementation reviews

Legislative review of report

Transparency of review process

Conflict of interest rules

Statutory requirement for post-implementation reviews: It is a statutory requirement to conduct post-implementation reviews of projects, with the criteria for project selection, structure of the report and process for conducting the reviews clearly defined.

Conflict of interest rules: There are clear conflict of interest rules which ensure neutrality of the review, such as the use of third-party agencies.

Transparency of review process: The selection of projects for post-implementation review and the review reports are available to the public and also available at a later date (archived).

Legislative review of report: Legislative review of post-implementation review reports, if necessary, are undertaken in a time-bound manner and the legislative committee recommendations are publicly available.

Impact of post-implementation reviews: Post-implementation reviews inform policy review, planning, project selection and budget allocations.

Guidance for Assessment:

Post-implementation reviews require to be done just once or may need to be periodic in nature (such as an annual review). The time at which the review takes place will also depend on the type of project and the specification of outcomes for different time periods after implementation of the project (for instance there may be some short-term expected outcomes and some long-term outcomes - which would have to be checked against by reviews that take place at those times).

The policies/rules/standard operating procedures for the conducting of post-implementation reviews, the criteria for project selection and the terms used for them to be done should be acquired and studied. Whether documents about such reviews undertaken in the past are available in the public domain should be noted. In case where rules do not exist, but an executive/regulatory body decides that these are to be done on a case-by-case basis, then the manner in which those decisions were made should be studied, by accessing minutes of meetings, or other such records. Where such studies have actually been conducted, the documents related to legislative review should also be used to decide these elements of quality. Finally, these post-implementation project reviews should inform policy, plans, project selection and budget allocations. Evidence of this should also be investigated and examples, if any, documented.

Elements of Quality

Relevance of the Indicator:

In addition to specifying the expected outcomes of a project in the project design phase, it is important to check against those outcomes by means of post-implementation reviews. Such reviews can help planners to identify lacunae in planning or design and also gain a better understanding of externalities that can affect project outcomes. Such reviews can thus help to improve future planning and design of projects. It is thus an important accountability tool (“did the project deliver what was promised?”).

Guidance for Assessment:

Post-implementation reviews may require to be done just once or may need to be periodic in nature (such as an annual review). The time at which the review takes place will also depend on the type of project and the specification of outcomes for different time periods after implementation of the project (for instance there may be some short-term expected outcomes and some long-term outcomes – which would have to be checked against by reviews that take place at those times).

The policies/rules/standard operating procedures for the conducting of post-implementation reviews, the criteria for project selection and the terms used for them to be done should be acquired and studied. Whether documents about such reviews undertaken in the past are available in the public domain should be noted. In case where rules do not exist, but an executive/regulatory body decides that these are to be done on a case-by-case basis, then the manner in which those decisions were made should be studied, by accessing minutes of meetings, or other such records. Where such studies have actually been conducted, the documents related to legislative review should also be used to decide these elements of quality. Finally, these post-implementation project reviews should inform policy, plans, project selection and budget allocations. Evidence of this should also be investigated and examples, if any, documented.

Elements of Quality

Relevance of the Indicator:

In addition to specifying the expected outcomes of a project in the project design phase, it is important to check against those outcomes by means of post-implementation reviews. Such reviews can help planners to identify lacunae in planning or design and also gain a better understanding of externalities that can affect project outcomes. Such reviews can thus help to improve future planning and design of projects. It is thus an important accountability tool (“did the project deliver what was promised?”).

Guidance for Assessment:

Post-implementation reviews may require to be done just once or may need to be periodic in nature (such as an annual review). The time at which the review takes place will also depend on the type of project and the specification of outcomes for different time periods after implementation of the project (for instance there may be some short-term expected outcomes and some long-term outcomes – which would have to be checked against by reviews that take place at those times).

The policies/rules/standard operating procedures for the conducting of post-implementation reviews, the criteria for project selection and the terms used for them to be done should be acquired and studied. Whether documents about such reviews undertaken in the past are available in the public domain should be noted. In case where rules do not exist, but an executive/regulatory body decides that these are to be done on a case-by-case basis, then the manner in which those decisions were made should be studied, by accessing minutes of meetings, or other such records. Where such studies have actually been conducted, the documents related to legislative review should also be used to decide these elements of quality. Finally, these post-implementation project reviews should inform policy, plans, project selection and budget allocations. Evidence of this should also be investigated and examples, if any, documented.

Elements of Quality
Executing Authority 17 – Capacity for Project Contracting, Specification, Execution, Audit and Post-Implementation Review

Relevance of the Indicator:
In addition to the technical/engineering skills and capacity of the executing authority staff, its capacity for carrying out various allied functions, which contribute to the delivery of quality products (projects and services) to the public and a “good” transport system (as defined earlier in this toolkit) overall, is critical. These functions are already part of the assessment toolkit and various indicators have been defined to evaluate the robustness of the processes and the quality of the public participation. The current indicator will help to assess the capacity of the staff to be able to actually carry out the functions prescribed.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the executing authorities being assessed it should be ascertained if processes are in place that help the authority to prepare guidelines/documents related to project contracting, project specification/design, project execution, physical audit of projects and post-implementation reviews. The first line of investigation by the assessment team should be the existence of these documents/guidelines in the first place and then the manner in which (the process by which) these were developed. The periodicity of the review of these documents may either be specified or may be undertaken as a matter of practice and this should also be determined. For the staff members associated with these functions, the training that they have undertaken (such as attendance of courses, workshops, seminars etc.) should be noted. Access to documents, guidelines, best practices and tools for contracting, project design, execution, audits and post-implementation reviews for the staff should also be determined. Interviews of key personnel of the executing authority would be useful in this determination.

Elements of Quality
- Robust process for preparing project design, execution and evaluation documents: Processes are specified for the preparation of various project design, execution and evaluation documents
- Periodic review of project design, execution and evaluation documents and operational procedures: Project design, execution and evaluation documents are periodically reviewed and updated
- Training and access to expertise: Staff undergoes training and has access to resources for development of these skills

Executing Authority 18 – Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of Projects

Relevance of the Indicator:
Large urban transport projects will have a substantial impact on the urban environment. It is essential that these are recognized, quantified and mitigation efforts are incorporated into the project design and resources allocated accordingly. This is a critical aspect of any project planning and execution for which the implementing agency must be accountable.

Guidance for Assessment:
The laws that govern the implementation of projects, especially large ones, that may have some measure of environmental as well as social impacts, and the environmental laws of the country/state/region will be the basis for the determination of the elements of quality for this indicator. The assessment team should also conduct in-depth interviews of officials in the environmental agency, senior officials from the executing authority of typical urban transport projects, as well as prominent environmental groups. Media reports on this subject will also help the team to be able to ask the right questions. For at least three different types of projects, actual environmental and social impact assessments, the manner in which they were conducted, the response of the executive, and the transparency of the process should be analyzed and documented.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for EIA/SIA: The laws of the land require EIA/SIA studies to be conducted for projects and do not arbitrarily exempt certain types of urban transport projects
- Comprehensiveness of EIA/SIA: The EIA/SIA studies require the consideration of full life-cycle impacts, including carbon emissions of the project, for all phases from construction to maintenance and operations
- Response of the environmental agency: The environmental agency reviews the EIA/SIA report and submits its response to the report along with recommendations for mitigation to the executing authority
- Response of the executing authority: The executive authority takes due cognizance of the recommendations of the environmental agency and makes appropriate inclusions in the contractual terms and conditions and design of the project
- Transparency of process: All documents and reports are published and easily accessible to the public. Documents are available later also (archived)
Executing Authority 19 – Public Participation in Environmental and Social Impact Assessment

Relevance of the Indicator:
In addition to the requirement that the executing authority should carry out Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (EIA/SIA) of (certain) projects, these assessments should also involve public participation. The involvement of stakeholders in the process will ensure that the assessments are comprehensive and that concerns of the public regarding the social and environmental impacts these projects will render are taken fully into account. This is especially true when transport projects lead to impacts on communities, such as the urban poor and other vulnerable groups.

Guidance for Assessment:
The EIA/SIA guidelines, either generic (issued by an external authority, such as an environmental agency) or that used specifically by the executing authority for urban transport projects, should be studied to determine the requirements for public consultations and the manner in which this is to be conducted. For projects being assessed for which EIA/SIA has been undertaken, the actual public consultation process should be studied. The stakeholders who participated and the inputs received should allow the assessment team to determine the quality of elements for this indicator. Interviews of key staff of the executing authorities as well as people who participated in these processes would provide insights. In case consultants are used for EIA/SIA, the terms of reference for consultants with regards to the requirement for public consultations should be noted. Consultants may also be interviewed.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for stakeholder consultations: There is a statutory requirement for consulting people during the EIA/SIA of projects
- Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultation process: Ample opportunity is provided to people to be able to participate in the process. The process for participation is fair and allows for all sections of society to be able to participate

Executing Authority 20 – Capacity for Carrying out Environmental and Social Impact Assessment

Relevance of the Indicator:
The requirement to conduct Environment and Social Impact Assessments (EIA/SIA) can only be fulfilled if the executing authority has the requisite skills to be able to undertake these studies. EIA and SIA studies are specialized and involve capacities. Skills must be developed specifically for this purpose. In many cases specialized agencies (consultants) may be employed by the executing authorities. Nonetheless the authority must have enough in-house capacity to be able to ensure that the studies are undertaken in the proper manner, be able to vet the reports and take decisions to mitigate the impacts identified.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the executing authorities being assessed, it should be ascertained that there are staff members who have been designated for conducting EIA/SIA studies either on their own, or by an external agency. The qualifications of these staff members and their experience should be ascertained. The number and type of training undertaken by the staff should also be determined. For the projects being assessed, in case EIA/SIA was undertaken, the involvement of the staff from the executing authority will provide an insight to their capacity. In case an external agency did the EIA/SIA, they would also be a source to determine the guidance they received from the executing authority staff during the process. Finally, the financial resources available for designated staff members to attend training and other skill enhancement exercises should be noted.

Elements of Quality
- Training and skill enhancement opportunities for EIA/SIA: Processes are specified for the preparation of various project design, execution and evaluation documents
- Designated staff: Project design, execution and evaluation documents are periodically reviewed and updated
- Dedicated financial resources: Staff undergoes training and has access to resources for development of these skills
Budgeting 1 – Budget Process

Relevance of the Indicator:
Budgets significantly decide the actual implementation of plans and projects and the allocations will determine to a large extent, the actual urban transport system that gets created. Budgets also reflect the priorities of the government and are a powerful statement of whether the policy pronouncements are going to be respected. It is thus a critical internal as well as public accountability tool.

Guidance for Assessment:
This assessment will have to be undertaken for each body (executive and regulatory) that is responsible for implementation of some part of the urban transport plan. The budgeting process, the structure of the budget, criteria for allocations and whether or not outcome budgeting is practiced will be determinable from an analysis of policy/rules, an analysis of the budgets themselves and interviews with key officials and legislative members. Officials interviewed should include both, departmental officials as well as accounts/budget/finance department officials and senior officers (who may be responsible for budgeting of many departments, such as executive/legislative head of the city government).

Elements of Quality
- Clarity of budgeting process: There is a clear process, including timelines, for budget determination and approval, and the structure of the budget is well-defined
- Requirement for plan implementation: There exist statutory requirements or guidelines for the budget to implement the plan and “plan expenditure” is clearly identified in the budget
- Criteria for budget allocations: There exist criteria or guidelines for the executive agencies/departments to determine budgetary allocations and priorities for various heads, such as for maintenance, completion of projects, administration, surveys and data collection, training and capacity enhancement, new projects etc.
- Outcome budgeting: The budget also quantifies the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of various transportation service level benchmarks
- Budget financing: The revenue details to meet urban transport outlays, such as the source, amount, basis for estimation and terms and conditions attached (if any) are specified

Budgeting 2 – Capacity of Budgeting Team

Relevance of the Indicator:
Preparing a budget for urban transport is a technically challenging exercise. Projects may have complex financing structures, involve loans, public-private partnerships and such other complex instruments. Budgetary constraints are commonly experienced. It is therefore essential that executing authorities have the expertise to carry out this task. Well-made budgets will reflect the plan priorities while balancing the financial constraints. The capacity of the budgeting team therefore is an important capacity indicator.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team should gather information about the staff responsible for preparing budgets for the executing authority and/or regulatory authority selected for the assessment. The key staff members responsible for preparing budgets must either possess financing qualifications and be familiar with best practices in urban transport budgeting, or have demonstrated experience in the subject. Whether the staff has opportunities for training and skill enhancement should be ascertained and actual training undertaken should be documented. Finally, the assessment team should also inquire about the staff’s ability to access information (best practices, guidelines, documents etc.) and access to tools used for budgeting. Interviews with staff members, standard operating procedures followed for some of the recent budgeting exercises should be reviewed.

Elements of Quality
- Qualification/experience of budgeting staff: Authority has well qualified and/or experienced staff in financing and budgets
- Training and skill enhancement: Staff involved in budget preparation has attended training, related to financing and budgets, in the last couple of years
- Access to knowledge: Staff involved in preparing budgets has access to documentation and tools used for preparing high quality budgets
Budgeting 3 – Public Inputs into the Budget

Relevance of the Indicator:
Increasingly the concept of “participatory budgeting” is gaining ground and can be a useful component in the overall budgeting exercise that not only creates an opportunity for communities to comment on the budget allocations but also ensure allocations for smaller community-level issues. The democratization of budgeting is a powerful antidote to the capture of public funds by vested or narrow interests.

Guidance for Assessment:
The budgeting process will have to be studied to determine provisions, if any, for public inputs to the budget and the manner in which this is achieved. The inputs may be sought during the preparation phase or on the draft budget. Availability of past budgets should be noted. An analysis of at least two previous budgets will have to be undertaken to determine if sector-wise/sub-sector-wise allocations are apparent. Interviews with public officials and members of civil society organizations as well as media will help to evaluate the elements of quality for this indicator.

Elements of Quality

- **Provision for seeking public inputs**: The budgeting process includes the provision for calling for suggestions from the public with regards to local transport-related issues.
- **Allocation for public-suggested projects specified**: The budgeting process/statute specifies an amount (absolute, range, percentage etc.) specifically allocated for public inputs or suggestions.
- **Well-defined participatory process**: There are clear guidelines specified for how public inputs will be sought, processed and decided upon for inclusion or otherwise.
- **Participatory process is inclusive**: The participatory process has specific provisions for ensuring inputs from and consideration of submissions by marginalized and/or vulnerable sections, such as the urban poor, pedestrians, women, children, the disabled etc.
- **Public comments on draft budget**: The budgeting process allows for publication of the draft budget (or parts of it) before finalization, for comments/suggestions from the public.
- **Budgets available to the public**: Budget documents are available to the public and are in a format that allows for ease of understanding of allocations made in the transport sector and sub-sectors within it. Budget line items are unambiguous and specific.

Budgeting 4 – Legislative Review of Budget

Relevance of the Indicator:
Budgets are finally approved by a legislative body and often has the power to make changes to the budget submitted by the executing authority. The manner in which the final approval of the budget takes place is an important element in the budgeting process. While the sanctioning of the budget gives legitimacy to it and can allow for other political considerations, it can also create an opportunity for vested interests and can distort the budget and hence the outcomes. The quality of the legislative review process is thus an important consideration.

Guidance for Assessment:
The Act/policy/rules that govern the sanction of budgets will provide information related to the process for legislative review and sanction. For at least two previous budgets, documents related to the legislative review will also have to be accessed and studied to understand the rationale provided for any changes to the budget. The availability of these documents to the public (either upon request or through publication on a website etc.) should also be noted. Stakeholder interviews may also be conducted to understand if the process is transparent.

Elements of Quality

- **Criteria for legislative review**: There exist guidelines for the legislative committee that reviews budgets and makes recommendations for changes before final approval/sanction.
- **Rationale for changes**: The legislative committee is required to provide rationale for any changes made to the budget and the budget outcomes are updated accordingly.
- **Transparency of legislative review process**: The recommendations made by the legislative committee in the budget are documented and are publicly available.
Budgeting 5 – Budget Re-allocation Process

Relevance of the Indicator:
While a great deal of attention may be given to the budget preparation, what usually receives far less attention is the process of budget re-allocations. This is often required since the ground reality of implementation of projects and schemes in actuality change (projects can get delayed, there may be cost-escalations, revenue shortfalls etc.). Budgets thus re-allocated can significantly differ from the budget that was approved thus changing the expected outcomes. Re-allocations in the budget also create an opportunity for influence by vested interests and thus accountability of this process is a key element of the governance assessment.

Guidance for Assessment:
Policy/rules for re-allocation of budget during the budget period will have to be analyzed to determine the process and if this is well-defined. The policy/rules will also reveal criteria, if any, for re-allocations. The requirement to publish the rationale and details of the budget changes and re-publication of the budget itself after the re-allocation process should be noted. For at least two previous budget years, such re-allocation exercises (there may be multiple instances of budget re-allocations in a budget period) should be studied and process followed noted. Interviews with legislative members, key officials (both departmental and those related to budgeting/accounts/financing), civil society members as well as media should be undertaken to get further clarity on the process and in determination of the element of quality.

Elements of Quality
- Clarity on re-allocation process: The process by which re-allocations can be made within the budget is well-defined
- Criteria for re-allocations: Re-allocations in the budget are required to be justified, the budget and the expected outcomes are updated accordingly
- Transparency of the change process: Budget re-allocations, including the rationale, are documented and are publicly available

Budgeting 6 – Public Participation in the Budget Re-allocation Process

Relevance of the Indicator:
In addition to transparency in the budget re-allocation process, it is equally important that public inputs are also sought. Getting public inputs ensures that priorities of the public at large are given due consideration and vested interests are not allowed to capture the process.

Guidance for Assessment:
The requirement for seeking public inputs at some stage of a budget re-allocation should be established. This may stem from a statutory requirement or as part of a general policy or standard practice that requires public participation during these kinds of processes. The manner in which public inputs are sought and how these inputs are used should be investigated. This will also help determine if the public participatory process is meaningful and enables participation of a broad spectrum of people. For the budget re-allocation events under consideration the actual manner in which the consultations took place and the quality and quantum of inputs received will also help the assessment team determine the elements of quality for this indicator. Interviews with staff and if possible, people who provided inputs during the budget re-allocation should also be conducted.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for public inputs on budget re-allocation: The process by which re-allocations can be made within the budget is well-defined
- Clarity on the public consultation process: Re-allocations in the budget are required to be justified, the budget and the expected outcomes are updated accordingly
- Quality and inclusiveness of the public consultation process: Budget re-allocations, including the rationale, are documented and are publicly available
Budgeting 7 – Budget Auditing

Relevance of the Indicator:
Budget audits provide clarity on the final implementation of the previous budget, not just from a financial or an accounting point of view, but to understand typically what sort of projects and programs get completed successfully, cost and time delays, the accuracy of estimates (including revenues) and is an important accountability tool. While budget auditing is an entire science in itself, for the purpose of urban transport governance, limited elements of quality for this indicator that will help better understand financial aspects of urban transport will be considered.

Guidance for Assessment:
Budget audits will typically be conducted within the department, but could also include third-party or completely independent audits. The assessment team should document the process followed by audits as a whole and for urban transport (sector as a whole or individual projects/programs) specifically. Various audited budgets should also be analyzed. The availability of these documents and whether they are in formats that are easy to comprehend should be noted. Media reports may be used in this assessment. Interviews should help determine if audit information is known to policy makers and whether and in what manner they have helped to inform budgeting exercises. Documents that support any claims should be sought.

Elements of Quality
- Clarity on audit process: The process by which budgets are audited is well-defined and time-bound
- Audit results published: Budget audits are published and in formats that are easily understood
- Audit information used for future planning: Information gleaned from budget audits are used to inform policy formulation, planning and specifically future budgeting
Regulatory Authorities

There may exist a number of regulatory authorities related to various functions within urban transport. Typically these may relate to planning, infrastructure development, control of vehicles, regulation of various services, such as public transport and intermediate public transport (taxis, rickshaws etc.). Some large urban transport systems such as metro rail may have separate regulatory authorities.

Regulatory Authority 1 – Existence and Neutrality of the Regulatory Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
For each regulatory space in the existing urban transport system there should be a corresponding regulatory authority which functions independently of the executing authority (Ministry, Ministerial Department, Municipal Body etc.). The regulatory body will derive its authority from the legislation that brings it into existence. It will be given powers to make decisions that have the ability to impact the public at large and operators. The constitution of any such body is therefore critical to its ability to operate in a fair and just manner and requires members who are both knowledgeable, experienced and do not have conflict of interests.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the urban transport system under consideration the assessment team must first list the regulatory aspects, that is to say those functions which would lend themselves to independent regulation. Typical regulatory functions are listed in the introduction of this section, but there may be more. This identification will be based on best practices followed elsewhere as well as through stakeholder interviews with experts in the field (urban transport or governance). For each such regulatory function, whether an independent regulatory authority exists should be determined. An independent regulatory authority may not necessarily be a wholly independent body, but should be identifiable as one that plays a regulatory role. The independence (or otherwise) of this body and the extent to which it is independent (in its functioning) can be determined by the legislation that establishes it. The same legislation should also establish the manner in which its members are appointed and the process for the same, including the way in which conflict of interest and post-separation conditions apply.

Elements of Quality
- Independent regulatory body: A regulatory body can be identified which performs the regulatory functions necessary for the area of urban transport under consideration and is independent from the executive.
- Appointment of members: Policies, procedures and criteria for selection and terms of appointment of the regulatory body are documented and readily available to aid transparency and attract appropriate candidates.
- Managing conflict of interest: Rules are specified to ensure that formal members do not have any conflict of interest and any such resource persons who may have a conflict of interest (required for their technical expertise or industry knowledge) are part of an advisory or consultative committee instead.
- Policy for post-separation employment: There is a policy in place regarding the post-separation employment of senior regulatory staff (such as a mandatory cool off period).

Regulatory Authority 2 – Autonomy and Mandate of the Regulatory Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
The regulatory authority should have a sufficiently broad mandate and the autonomy to be able to effectively carry out its functions are defined under the law. Managing the balance between the authority and accountability of the regulatory body is never easy, but ideally the regulatory authority should be able to operate without interference at individual decision-making level while being overall accountable to the executive or legislative bodies.

Guidance for Assessment:
The legislation and the attendant rules and standard operating procedures for the regulatory body being assessed will reveal the various aspects that can help to determine the elements of quality under consideration. In addition, interviews must be conducted of members of the regulatory body itself (preferably present members, past members may also be consulted). Documentation in the possession of the regulatory body itself or published on its website (if one exists) should also be examined. The actual manner in which some of the existing members have been appointed should be analyzed as well as any members that have been removed recently, prior to expiry of their term. The budget for at least two years should be examined, more for the manner in which it is sanctioned than the actual content of the budget itself. The differences in a draft budget (or proposed budget) by the regulatory body and the sanctioned budget may also help to reveal the degree of financial autonomy enjoyed by the body.

Elements of Quality
- Clarity of role: The regulatory and other functions to be carried out to achieve the regulator’s objectives are clearly specified in the establishing legislation.
- Breadth of jurisdiction: The regulatory body is given sufficient jurisdiction so that it can regulate the sector effectively, having control of all aspects which will influence that particular sector.
- Mandate: Decisions by the regulatory body are not just recommendatory in nature and it is empowered to make independent decisions, which are normally binding.
- Authority to enforce: The regulatory authority is empowered to investigate, serve notice to violators and penalize them, these powers having been specified in the establishing legislation.
- Clarity of power of executive direction: Where legislation empowers the executive to direct an independent regulator, the limits of the power to direct the regulator are clearly set out. The legislation is clear about what can be directed and when.
- Transparency in executive direction: Any direction made by the executive or politicians is required to be documented and published.
- Tenure: The members of the regulatory body have a fixed tenure and grounds for removal of any member prior to expiry of tenure are specified and subject to legislative and/or judicial review.
- Financial autonomy: The regulatory body is sufficiently financially independent so that it is able to function effectively and without external influence.
Regulatory Authority 3 – Capacity of the Regulatory Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
The regulatory function requires both a keen study of the law as well as a deep understanding of the transport sector being regulated. A good regulator should be able to strike the proper balance between those being regulated (such as service providers) to ensure the well-being of the sector as well as the public being served. Dispensation of cases often requires the regulator to perform a quasi-judicial role. A proper understanding of the market, emerging technologies and economics of the sector is also essential. In order to dispense properly the duties assigned to the regulatory body, the capacity of its members therefore becomes critical, which this indicator captures.

Guidance for Assessment:
The qualifications of the regulatory members should be procured and it should be determined if their technical qualifications, experience and understanding of the field is adequate for the role they are expected to play. The quantum and type of training opportunities available to them should be ascertained. The information, data, reports, documentation, guidelines and legal materials available to the regulators should be noted. Interviews with existing as well as ex-regulators would provide insights into these elements of quality.

Elements of Quality
- Qualification of members: Regulators have technical qualifications, regulatory experience and good grasp of the legal framework
- Opportunities for skill enhancement: Regulators have opportunities for training to enhance skills and improve knowledge related to the field
- Access to knowledge: Regulators have access to guidelines, documents, best practices, legal documentation etc.

Regulatory Authority 4 – Clarity in Functioning of the Regulatory Authority

Relevance of the Indicator:
The regulatory authority should have clear guidelines for its functioning and should do so in a transparent manner. Maintaining and publication of information will act to ensure the proper functioning of the regulatory authority and inspire confidence in a working of the regulator as a free and fair entity.

Guidance for Assessment:
The documentation that establishes the manner in which the regulatory authority makes its decisions, the criteria for making those decisions and the public interface process will be key to assess the functioning of the body. This may be part of the legislation, the rules or internal procedures set by the body itself. Regulatory decisions made by the body for up to one year should be accessed and analyzed, as these will also reveal information about the manner in which the body functions. Interviews of regulatory body members, those who are affected by the regulatory decisions as well as the public (both individuals as well as civil society organizations) would be essential. The decisions that are available publicly and how far back can decisions be accessed as well as the manner in which they can be accessed should also be documented.

Elements of Quality
- Decision-making criteria: The criteria to be used by the regulatory body while making decisions are well-defined
- Record keeping: The decisions taken are required documented and publicly available
- Timeframe for decisions: The timeframe within which decisions are to be made is specified
- Justification for decisions: Regulatory decisions are supported by rationale and where necessary backed by data
- Publication of orders/decisions: All orders and decisions made by the regulatory authority are publicized and easily accessible. Orders are available for a length of time and this is specified (archived orders)
Regulatory Authority 5 – Public Consultations in Regulatory Decision-making

Relevance of the Indicator:
Regulatory decisions can span a wide spectrum, depending on the jurisdiction of the regulatory authority. For important decisions that affect the public it is important that stakeholders should be consulted as a matter of good governance, to ensure that the public opinion on the issue is also taken into account. The availability of all inputs received in public domain will also provide the public at large with a complete picture of public opinion/sentiment on the issue.

Guidance for Assessment:
The requirement for seeking public inputs while making regulatory decisions that affect the public should be checked by the assessment team, typically in the Act/statute that guides this process. Public inputs may also be sought as part of the standard practice followed by the regulatory authority and this may also be noted. The manner in which inputs are sought and how this is communicated to the public should be documented. The information that is available to people, such as the issue under consideration and supporting data, that allows people to form an informed opinion, will be useful to determine the elements of quality for this indicator. For the regulatory decisions under consideration the relevant documents should be reviewed and the public inputs actually received should be analyzed. Particular attention should be paid to deciding if the inputs received are from a broad spectrum of stakeholders. The availability in public domain of all inputs received and the response of the regulatory authority (individually or broadly addressing the types of inputs received) should be noted.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for stakeholder consultations: There is a statutory requirement or standard practice for stakeholder consultations for certain types of regulatory decisions
- Quality and inclusiveness of stakeholder consultations: Ample opportunity is provided to people to be able to provide inputs, information is available and the process allows a broad spectrum of people to provide inputs
- Publication of public comments and response: All public inputs received and response of the regulatory authority are published

Regulatory Authority 6 – Re-negotiation/Termination of Contracts

Relevance of the Indicator:
The regulatory authority (responsible for contractual agreements within its jurisdiction) must also have the ability to effectively manage re-negotiation of contracts under certain circumstances. Ensuring that such renegotiations are transparent, follow due procedure and that public interest is protected are some of the key concerns for the regulatory authority. In extreme cases, contracts or concessionaire agreements may also be terminated and may go into a judicial process. The regulator will play an important role in this case and work to protect public interests.

Guidance for Assessment:
For the regulator under scrutiny, the process to be followed by it for contract or concessionaire re-negotiation or termination will be a part of the legislation that established it. However considerable leeway may be given to the regulator to decide this process, within the framework laid down by the policy and hence a study of internal rules and guidelines as well as interviews of members would also be crucial to undertake. Any actual re-negotiations or terminations should also be studied, in particular the assessment team should note the frequency with which this happens. Media reports, if any, as well as other articles and critiques published by civil society organizations and academic institutions may also be noteworthy.

Elements of Quality
- Initiation of re-negotiation or termination proceedings: The policy specifies the circumstances under which re-negotiation or termination of the contract or concession agreement may be initiated by either the regulatory authority or contract holder
- Clarity of renegotiating or termination process: The process to be followed for re-negotiating or terminating contracts, including appointment of review committees, reports to be submitted by the contract holder and framework within which the negotiations can take place are specified
- Public consultation: The re-negotiation or termination process is subject to a public consultative element to ensure transparency in the proceedings
- Submission of report by the regulatory authority: The regulator is required to prepare and submit a report with recommendations based on the proceedings including the public inputs keeping in mind the larger public interests
- Review by the executive: The report of the regulatory authority is required to be considered by the executive and its recommendations are published
Regulatory Authority 7 – Tariff Philosophy

Relevance of the Indicator:
One of the functions of transport regulatory authorities is to set tariffs for a wide variety of public transport systems (rickshaws, taxis, Metro rail etc.). Tariff setting requires a balance between meeting the expectations of the operator and affordability for the commuter. Tariffs must also be linked to the quality of service. Tariff subsidies may also be considered in order to meet certain social or environmental obligations. Clarity about the objectives to be met and a comprehensive analysis of the economics of the services will help the regulator set tariffs in a fair manner and build confidence of the operators and the public.

Guidance for Assessment:
For regulatory bodies that are responsible for setting/revising fares the rules, guidelines and process to be followed may be part of the legislation, but may also be determined by the regulatory body itself and documented as part of its own approach to tariff regulation and these would need to be analyzed by the assessment team. In some cases, the executive (Ministry) may also specify the manner in which tariffs are to be revised through a notification or directive to the regulatory body and will have to be studied. The previous couple of tariff revisions should be looked at in some detail and will also reveal some key information about the tariff philosophy. Interviews of members, entities whose tariffs are revised, commuter groups, civil society organizations as well as academicians should be conducted to substantiate decision about the element of quality in consideration.

Elements of Quality
- Tariff objectives: It is required to state the broad objectives to be met by the tariff setting
- Comprehensiveness of analysis: The regulator is required to undertake a comprehensive analysis that considers various costs, impact on operators and commuters, affordability, quality of service and social and environmental obligations in coming up with the tariff or tariff "formula"
- Periodicity of revision: The triggers for or periodicity of tariff review or revision are defined

Regulatory Authority 8 – Public Consultations during Tariff Revision

Relevance of the Indicator:
Tariff revision is a sensitive issue where the regulator must strike a balance between the requirements of the service provider and the public at large. Public consultations are a necessary element of this process in any framework of governance. In particular tariff revisions can impact the urban poor and other marginalized sections of society and the regulator must make an effort to enable their point of view to be expressed and taken into consideration.

Guidance for Assessment:
A study of the statute governing this process will reveal whether there is a mandatory requirement for public consultations during any tariff revision. The actual manner in which public consultations must be undertaken may be specified in the statute or may be a matter of policy or standard practice followed by the regulatory authority in question, and should be documented. For the tariff revision, events being assessed, and the actual process followed should be noted. In particular, the manner in which public inputs were solicited, whether this was given ample publicity and whether there was enough time for people to give their inputs (including time for civil society organizations to mobilize public opinion) should be assessed. Actual inputs received, the quantum and whether they represent a broad section of society should be analyzed. Finally, the assessment team should determine if all public inputs received are available in public domain and whether these contain the regulator’s responses. As always interviews of regulators (or ex-regulators), civil society organizations or individuals who may have participated in this process will provide insights and help determine the elements of quality for this indicator.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement for public consultation: There is a statutory requirement for public consultation during any tariff revision
- Quality of public consultation process: Ample opportunity is provided to people to be able to provide inputs
- Inclusiveness of public consultations: The public consultation process is such that all sections of society, especially marginalized groups, have a fair opportunity to provide inputs
- Publication of public comments and response: All public inputs received and response of the regulatory authority are published
Regulatory Authority 9 – Appeals Process

Relevance of the Indicator:
Since the regulatory authority has the power to independently make decisions which can significantly affect the regulated entity, there should be an appeals mechanism that allows for review of decisions under certain circumstances. The appellate body will also be subject to the same criteria as any other urban transport authority.

Guidance for Assessment:
The assessment team will first determine the existence (or otherwise) of an appellate body and determine its functioning through the legislation/executive order etc. that establishes it. A determination will have to be made with regards to its independence from the regulatory body itself. Typically officers within the same organization acting as appellate authorities will not qualify as being "at arm's length", essential to avoid conflict of interest and ensure neutrality when reviewing decisions. A sample of appeals processed by the appellate should be analyzed and their public availability noted. Interviews with appellate authorities, as well as those who have filed appeals should also be conducted.

Elements of Quality
- Clarity of appeals process: The grounds on which appeals can be made, whether third-party appeals are allowed, the time-frame for appeals and the manner in which and the time-frame within which appeals will be processed are specified
- Appellate body at arm's length: The appellate body is sufficiently distinct from the regulatory decision makers, such as an independent appellate tribunal
- Decisions of the appellate are publicly available: The decisions of the appellate body are published and easily available to the public

Regulatory Authority 10 – Publication of Performance Information by Regulated Entities

Relevance of the Indicator:
The regulatory authority that deals with the regulation of service providers can ensure that there is transparency and public accountability of the service providers by requiring them to publish certain information. This also includes financial information which is key for the regulator while considering tariffs, subsidies and for making recommendations to the government regarding policy reforms. It also acts as a curb on the service providers and empowers the consumers, which amongst other things, is one of the key functions of a regulatory authority.

Guidance for Assessment:
An analysis of rules/procedures followed by the regulatory authority with regards to service providers will be the main source of information for determination of this indicator. Terms and conditions specified when service providers are first issued permits or when these are renewed will reveal information about the need for service providers to publish certain kinds of information. Reports required to be submitted and actual reports in the possession of the regulatory body should also be studied. Service providers should be interviewed as well as those who avail of the services (consumer/commuter groups or associations).

Elements of Quality
- Publication of price and standards of service: The regulatory authority requires that service providers display the “price” of the service as well as the “standards of service” that the consumer can expect
- Requirement for performance reporting: The regulator requires the regulated entity/service provider to periodically publish a report which includes service delivery performance metrics and contain aspects such as safety, accessibility and environmental and social parameters
- Requirement for financial reporting: The regulator requires the regulated entity/service provider to periodically publish a financial report which includes information regarding revenues and expenditure
- Public comments on reports: The regulator seeks public comments on the reports submitted by the regulated entities/service providers
- Grievance redressal: The regulator requires that the service provider set-up a grievance redressal for customers with requirement to publish the grievance redressal information
Regulatory Authority 11 – Performance Reporting by the Regulator

Relevance of the Indicator:
The regulator exists to achieve objectives deemed by government to be in the public interest and operates using the powers conferred by the legislature. A regulator is therefore accountable to the legislature, whether directly or through the executive. It should regularly report publicly on the fulfillment of its objectives and demonstrate that it is efficiently and effectively discharging its responsibilities with integrity and objectivity. Accountability and transparency is the other side of the coin of independence, and a balance is required between the two. Comprehensive accountability and transparency measures actively support good behavior and performance by the regulator, as they allow the regulator’s performance to be assessed by the legislature or any other responsible authority.

Guidance for Assessment:
The requirement to prepare annual plans, reports, the structure of those reports and the process to be followed for their preparation and submission to the executive or legislative body will typically be part of the legislation and rules that establish the regulatory body. Some of the details may also be found in the internal standard operating procedures followed by the regulatory body itself. The assessment team should also analyze the various reports prepared in the last couple of years and document the process, from their preparation to the legislative review and the manner in which they are made publicly available. As always, interviews of members of the regulatory body, as also key officials of the executive (Ministry) as well as some legislative members will also prove useful in the determination of these elements of quality.

Elements of Quality
- Requirement to prepare annual work plans: The regulatory authority is required to prepare and submit to the executive an annual work plan outlining the targets to be met and the manner in which this shall be achieved
- Requirement to submit an annual report: The regulatory authority is required to submit an annual report of its activities, reviewing its performance of the previous year
- Comprehensiveness of reporting: The annual report is required to report on the objectives that are required to be met by the regulator with reference to transport system aspects such as safety, accessibility, equity, efficiency and environmental and social aspects along with specific performance metrics
- Legislative review of performance of the regulator: The appropriate legislative committee reviews the annual performance reports of the regulator and makes recommendations to the regulatory and/or executive body
- Transparency: All reports prepared by the regulatory authority as well as the legislative recommendations are publicly available as soon as they are prepared

Process documentation

The development of the TGI toolkit has involved several participatory processes including case studies, interviews, series of workshops and consultations.

Case Studies
The initial step during development of the TGI toolkit was to research and document case studies to better understand the decision-making processes, actors and issues related to urban transport and more specifically, to capture the critical governance questions that would emerge from a quick assessment of some typical projects. Due to resource constraints, India (Pune) and Philippines (Metro Manila) were identified as case examples, to ensure that the governance issues are studied across different federal and institutional structures of government. The case studies and the investigations undertaken (research and stakeholder interviews) helped the team develop the basic framework of the TGI toolkit.

Workshops
First Review Workshop (6th June 2014)
The workshop was an attempt to present before a select audience the first draft of the toolkit. Some broad key areas that were covered in this workshop were the purpose and design of the toolkit, whether the toolkit would be based on some broad principles of sustainable transportation like equity/environment, future of the toolkit, whether there was a need to systematize indicators periodically and carry out assessments, whether institutionalizing the toolkit would help in its sustained use, elements of and ideal processes for urban transport, budgets, methodology to measure progress in governance, role of the regulatory authority, and bringing about on ground changes towards good governance.

Second Review Workshop (12th July 2014)
Once the draft toolkit was prepared it was subjected to a thorough (indicator by indicator) review by a large group of civil society and government actors – from India and select developing countries. Substantial feedback was received from this workshop which was fed into the toolkit.

Third Review Workshop (24th September 2014)
The third workshop addressed the theory of change – whether the TGI toolkit approach would be an effective tool to bring about a change in the governance processes in urban transport. While this question was outside the scope of investigations for the toolkit, the workshop did provide interesting inputs on how one might take the initiative forward and the methodology for carrying out assessments.

City Consultations (various, 2014-2015)
As part of the effort to get inputs from stakeholders in the urban transport sector while developing the Governance Indicators Framework, city consultations were conducted. The main objectives of these consultations were to introduce participants to the Transport Governance Initiative, get feedback on the approach and some key definitions, discuss specific aspects of Urban Transport Governance.
Final Review Workshop (7th April 2016)

The members of the TGI met to discuss the preliminary results of the assessments conducted to field test the toolkit in nine cities and four states in India, carried out by pilot teams. The discussions were centred on the results of the toolkit. The toolkit and the assessment were presented at Connect Karo (April 2017) which is part of a global series of events focused on sustainable urban development hosted by WRI Ross Center for Sustainable Cities. TGI was introduced to the participants along with the teams, the objectives, and detailed national and city-wise findings from the assessments using the indicators. The session concluded with meta findings and impressions on the overall state of transport governance in the country, as well as the selected cities, along with listing out the next steps in the process.

Finally, it is hoped that the use of this toolkit will enhance better governance in urban transport sector by applying the tools developed to carry out assessments, enabling greater availability of information, enhancing the capacity of stake holders to comprehend and process the available information, thus improving decision-making processes and pushing for reforms through civil society partnerships and government agencies.
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