

Submission of Proposals: Application Form

*Please read carefully the "Guidelines for the Submission of Proposals" which outline the modalities for application and the criteria for the selection of proposals spelled out in the Cities Alliance Charter. Please ensure that all necessary supporting documentation is attached to this form. Additional information may also be enclosed, **but total submission should not exceed 12 pages.***

Rec'd 23 February 2010

1. TITLE of PROPOSAL: India State of the Cities Report

2. PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY¹:

Name and Title: Prof. Chetan Vaidya, Director

Organisation: National Institute of Urban Affairs

Address: Core 4B, 1st Floor, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi

Telephone/Fax /E-mail: 91-11-24643576 / 91-11-24617513 / cvaidya@niua.org

Contact person for questions on the application:

Name and title of contact person: Dr. Debolina Kundu, Associate Professor, NIUA

Organisation: National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA)

Address: Core 4B, 1st Floor, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi

Telephone/Fax/E-mail: 91-11-24643576 / 91-11-24617513 email: dkundu@niua.org

3. CITIES ALLIANCE MEMBER(S) SPONSORING THE APPLICATION:

Name and Title: Mr. Richard Clifford, Lead Urban Specialist (TBC)

Organisation: World Bank

Address: 1818 H Street, NW, Washington DC 20433

Telephone/Fax/E-mail: 1 202 4737270/Rclifford@worldbank.org

Name and title of representative in charge: Eduardo Lopez Moreno, Head, City Monitoring Branch, Monitoring and Research Division (TBC)

Organization: UN-Habitat

Address: P.O. Box 30030 Nairobi 00100, Kenya

Telephone/Fax/Email: 254-20-762-3149/254-20-762 3080 E-mail:

eduardo.moreno@unhabitat.org

¹ Country-specific proposals typically originate from local authorities, but must be sponsored by at least one member of the Cities Alliance (see [Cities Alliance Charter](#), Section D.14).

Name and title of representative in charge: Andre Herzog, Senior Urban Specialist

Organization: World Bank Institute (TBC)

Address: 1818 H St NW, MSN J4-400, Washington DC, 20433

Telephone/Fax/Email: 1 202 4582683/1 202 6760978/aherzog@worldbank.org

4. RECIPIENT ORGANISATION: – *organisation that will receive and execute the grant:*

Task Manager Name and Title: Chetan Vaidya, Director

Organisation: National Institute of Urban Affairs

Address: Core 4B, 1st Floor, India habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi

Telephone/Fax /E-mail: 91-11-24643576 / 91-11-24617513 / cvaidya@niuua.org

5. OTHER IMPLEMENTING PARTIES (if any):

Task Manager Name & Title:

Organisation:

Address:

Contact Person/Title:

Telephone/Fax/E-mail:

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED PROJECT:

6. Type of project (*check one*):

City Development Strategy Slum Upgrading Both

7. Geographic scope of project (*specify*):

City: 42 cities

Country: India

Global/Regional/Multi-country: _____

8. Expected duration: 18 months

BUDGET SUMMARY:

9. Amount of total budget requested from Cities Alliance funding: US Dollars

USD 3,63,032

10. Co-financing amount of total budget, including local partners: US Dollars USD

2,04,206

11. Total project budget cost: US Dollars USD 5,67,238

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT:

12. Background – issues to be addressed and scope of project

Please give a brief outline of the main urban development trends and challenges that the country, province and city are facing, as far as they are relevant for the proposed project.

The Census 2001 indicates that 28 per cent of the population of the country lives in urban areas. Even at relatively low urbanization level, the total urban population of 285 million is more than the total population of several countries and accounts for a little over 10 per cent of the total urban population of the world and 21 per cent of the total urban population of Asia. There are 5,161 urban centers in the country. 62 per cent of the total urban population or about 196 million people live in 441 class I towns (with a population of 100,000 or more). Among them, there are 35 million plus cities accounting for 38 per cent of the total urban population of the country. By all standards, Indian urbanization, in number and size poses formidable challenges.

The salient aspects of urbanization in India in recent decades are:

- a) Growing concentration of urban population in large cities and agglomerations;
- b) Slowing down of urbanization during 1981-1991 and 1991-2001 as compared to 1971-1981 and 1961-1971; and
- c) Large variations in patterns of urbanization across regions and states.

The fast pace of urbanization, in absolute terms, has imposed increasing pressure on the level of existing services in the urban centres. Consequently, the positive role of urbanization has been over-shadowed by deterioration in the quality of built environment and quality of life. Although cities are considered as engines of economic growth and generators of resources for national economic development, the pattern of population concentration in large cities reflects the spatial polarization of income-earning opportunities. There is tremendous pressure to improve civic infrastructure systems: water supply, sewerage and drainage, solid waste management, parks and open spaces, transport, among others, lack of which has led to deterioration in the quality of city environments. In several cities, the problems of the traffic congestion, pollution, poverty, slums, crime, are assuming alarming proportions. In larger cities, deficiencies in services in urban areas are largely absorbed by the low-income and poorer sections of the population. Infrastructure inadequacies and inequitable distribution are accompanied by the absence of efficient and effective management systems, which have resulted in service leakages and financial losses and have, consequently, had an adverse impact on urban productivity and economic growth.

Financing of urban services such as water supply, sewerage, drainage, solid waste management and power requires huge amount of investment. ULBs are not in a position to facilitate the flow of investments due to their weak financial base and institutional incapacities. With inadequate return from the provision of services and also huge gap between demand and supply of the services, the ULBs are not able to cope up with the demand pressures. The fiscal transfers to local governments are also not commensurate with the level of urban population and related demand for basic services.

According to 54th round of National Sample Survey (NSS), 1998, 70 per cent of urban households reported being served by tap and 21 percent by tube well or hand pump. 66 percent of urban households reported having their principal source of water within their premises while

32 percent had it within 0.2 Km. Further, 41 percent had sole access to their principal source of drinking water and 59 percent were sharing a public source. The 54th round of NSS reported 26 percent of households having no latrines, 35 percent using septic tank and 22 percent using sewerage system. 43 percent of households in urban areas either had no latrines or no connection to a septic tank or sewerage. In urban areas sewerage connections varied from a low of 48 percent to a high of 70 percent. These statistics indicate the existing deficiencies. However, micro-level studies would indicate the deficiencies at the city level which may be much more alarming.

In India, there is a strong realization that its urban areas need to improve for the country to achieve fast and sustained economic development. In this context, the Government of India (GoI) has launched the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) through which it incentivized reforms in urban governance, service delivery, financial management and devolution of functions to local bodies, and linked grants for infrastructure investments in the major Indian cities. Despite the strong focus on urban reforms through the JNNURM, the policy-makers are still struggling to evolve mechanisms to develop municipalities as autonomous city management agencies to dovetail urbanization with economic development. **In this context, it is proposed to prepare the India State of the Cities Report (SoCR) to address issues that are critical for sustainable economic development of cities and provide inputs for developing an urban development approach for the country.**

13. Objectives

The broad objectives of India SoCR are to:

- a) Assess the urban infrastructure deficits and its impact on the national economic growth;
- b) Analyze relation between socio-economic development in states and cities, and spatial concentration of population;
- c) Assess the urban policies, and institutional and financing framework;
- d) Evaluate policy initiatives taken by countries facing similar problems like China, South Africa and Brazil, among others, to efficiently manage fast urban growth; and
- e) Identify areas for change in urban policies and recommend strategies to strengthen urban institutional and financing framework to meet urban infrastructure deficits and achieve balanced and inclusive development across states.

14. Methodology and sequencing of activities

Urban development is a state subject. Analyzing the state level scenario with regard to socio-economic development would help in understanding the development dynamics at the state level and capturing the state level specificities. Given the close relationship between urban infrastructure, urban productivity and national economy, the Report would assess the deficits in urban infrastructure and its adverse impact on the national GDP and recommend strategies to mobilize resources for urban infrastructure investments. Spatial concentration of economic activities in and around the mega cities (which are also the regional centers) and metropolises are influencing the choice of investment destinations, FDI flows and population redistribution in the country. In this perspective, the SOCR would test the hypothesis that the poor performance of some states in India (in terms of relatively low per capita state domestic product and low ranking in human development index) is due to absence of an economic hub in the state/region and recommend strategies for dispersal of economic investments across the states.

Analytical Framework:

The analysis at national, state and local levels would focus on:

- Strengths and weaknesses of urban policies, institutional, and financing framework and arrangements at national, state and local levels;
- Investment benefits, in the perspective of marginal productivity of capital and labour, in urban and rural areas;
- Strategic policy direction, policy framework and approaches for the sustainable and inclusive urbanization, based on empirical evidence ;
- Strategies to meet urban infrastructure backlog;
- Strategies to achieve balanced development across states (size-class of towns); and
- Future perspective and institutional framework for urban governance, given the increased responsibility of cities as institutions of local self-government in the post 74th CAA era.

Urban Infrastructure and Economic Development

- What is the ratio of investment in rural and urban sectors?
- What is the role of infrastructural development national/state level policies as drivers of growth of cities?
- How cities can be made more productive for national economic growth?
- How cities can promote equity in access to income-earning opportunities and habitat, and meet poverty reduction goals?

Balanced Regional Development

- What cities and regions (states) can do to counter imbalance regional development?
- How fast growing cities can be spread in different parts of the country?
- What is the strategy to propel economic growth in some areas/regions and cities, and how to catch up with inadequate social services in other cities/regions?
- Which cities/regions are ready to grow and the catalyzing factors, in terms of comparative advantages and geographic location advantages?

Policy and Institutional and Financing Framework

- Which other cities require support in terms of policies and finance? What kind of support do they require?
- What are the challenges for cities/states to implement urban reforms under JNNURM?
- What are the required institutional arrangements to facilitate economic growth?
- Which kind of mechanism can be used to finance cities that are less prosperous?
- In light of decentralization, to what extent can the cities of different sizes in various regions really manage delivery of services and support economic development?
- What is the quantum of public expenditure? Are the resources being spent in cities producing desirable outcomes?

Learning from Brazil and South Africa

India, Brazil and South Africa (IBSA) have entered into an agreement of cooperation in various sectors including human settlements. India SoCR, along with the SoCRs being prepared for Brazil and South Africa, would help to document initiatives in these countries for efficiently managing urban growth and identify areas of cooperation in this sector.

Methodology:

In the context of the issues raised in this section, the analysis in the report would be at national, state, and local levels.

National Level

The Report would:

- Analyze spatial and temporal pattern of urbanization across the country taking the major states as the unit of analysis, across states taking towns/cities grouped into size-class as units of analysis and across select cities taking wards as the units of analysis.
- Estimate the urban infrastructure deficits and its impact on the national economic growth.
- Examine the state of urbanization in the country with reference to the demographic, economic, infrastructure, environmental, energy, transport, communication, land, poverty, planning and other aspects.
- Review various policies and programmes including JNNURM, National Sanitation Policy, among others, and the recommendations of various Commissions, Committees and studies.
- Assess the institutional and financing framework for urban development and horizontal arrangement for peer learning.

State Level

Six states have been selected for the state-level analysis, based on their levels of urbanization (medium refers to +/- 2 per cent from national average), as also representing different regions in India. The states selected are: Assam in the North-East with low level of urbanization, Haryana in the North with medium level of urbanization, Madhya Pradesh in the center with medium level of urbanization, Gujarat in the West with high level of urbanization, West Bengal in the East with medium level of urbanization and Karnataka in the south with high level of urbanization.

Table: Level of Urbanization of Selected States

State	Level of Urbanization
Assam	12.72
Gujarat	37.35
Haryana	29.00
Karnataka	33.98
Madhya Pradesh	26.67
West Bengal	28.03

Source: Town Directory, Census 2001

The Report would:

- Estimate the urban infrastructure deficits and its impact on the state's economic growth.
- Examine the status of urbanization in the state with reference to the demographic, economic (municipal budgets including transfers to ULBs from Central and State Governments), infrastructure, environmental, energy, transport, communication, land, poverty, planning and other aspects, taking size class of towns as the units of analysis.
- Analyze the spatial and temporal pattern of urbanization across the state taking towns/cities grouped into size-class as units of analysis.
- Review various policies and programs at the state level and identify best practices for urban development.
- Assess the vertical institutional and financing framework for urban development and horizontal arrangement for peer learning.

Local Level

India SoCR would be based on situational analysis in 42 cities in the 6 selected states. Seven towns/cities have been selected from each state, 2 each from the size-class of <1,00,000 and 1,00,000 to 5,00,000 and 3 from the size-class of > 5,00,000. However, for those states where cities are absent in the size-class of > 5,00,000, they have been taken from the next category, i.e, 100,000-5,00,000.

The following cities have been selected:

Sl.N	State/cities	Civic status ²	Population(by size class)		
			500000+	100000 -500000	< 100000
1	Gujarat				
	Ahmadabad	M.C	3,520,085		
	Vadodara	M.C.	1,306,553		
	Surat	M.C	2,433,835		
	Jamnagar	M.C		443,518	
	Navsari	(M.		134017	
	Mahesana	M.			99,880
	Khambhat	(M			93194
2	Karnataka				
	Bangalore	M.C	4,301,326		
	Hubli-Dharwad	M.C	786,195		
	Mysore	M.C	755,379		
	Gulbarga	M.C		422,569	
	Mangalore	M.C		399,565	
	Bagalkot	CMC			90,988
	Ramanagaram)	CMC			79,394
3	Haryana				
	Faridabad	M.C	1,055,938		
	Rohtak	MCL		286,807	
	Panipat	MCL		261,740	
	Hisar	MCL		256,689	
	Gurgaon	MCL		172,955	
	Narnaul	MCL			62,077
	Fatehabad	MC			59,917
4	Madhya-Pradesh				
	Indore	M.C	1,474,968		
	Bhopal	M.C	1,437,354		
	Gwalior	M.C	827,026		
	Ujjain	M.C		430,427	
	Sagar	M.C		232,133	
	Datia	M			82,755
	Hoshangabad	M			97,424
5	Assam				
	Guwahati	M.C	809,895		
	Dibrugarh	M.B.		121,893	
	Nagaon	M.B.		107,667	
	Tinsukia				85,563
	Tezpur				80,575
	Jorhat				67,588
	Dhubri				64,168
6	West Bengal				
	Kolkatta	M.C	4,572,876		
	Durgapur	M.C		493,405	
	Asansol	M.C		475,439	
	Siliguri	M.C		472,374	
	Darjling	M		107,197	
	Jangipur	M			74,458
	Dhulian	M			72,850

Source:Census of India, 2001

² MC: Municipal Corporation, MCL: Municipal Council, MB: Municipal Body, M: Municipality

The Report would:

1. Estimate the correlation coefficient and regression coefficient between urban infrastructure and per capita city product, controlling for exogenous factors. The regression coefficient would then be used for extrapolating the impact of urban infrastructure backlog on national and state product. This would require methodological innovation for estimating the per capita city product. The Report would assess the methodology suggested by UN Habitat (Global Urban Observatory programme) for estimating the city product based on labor force and labor productivity estimates at state and city level. Alternatively, data on city's economic growth would be plotted from the city level data brought out by Annual Survey of Industries and companies' data. This would act as a proxy for data on organized manufacturing at the city level. Based on data from Economic Survey, Economic Census, NSSO etc., ratios of the unorganized sector and other sectors would also be calculated.
2. Demographic analysis in the perspective of economic (municipal budgets including transfers to ULBs from Central and State Governments), infrastructure, environmental, energy, transport, communication, land, poverty, planning and other aspects, taking wards as the units of analysis. A set of local level indicators would be developed for city-level analysis. These indicators would largely be developed based on the information available from secondary sources and quick surveys, for critical indicators for which data are not available. Information at local level would be obtained on population growth, density, income, economic base of towns, level of services, urban governance, municipal finance, slum population, pace of building construction, FDI flows, natural and man-made disasters in last ten years, energy use, transportation, quality of air and water, institutional structures, governance, etc.
3. Review various policies and programs at the city level and identify best practices for urban development. It may be useful to obtain the perspective of the business community to assess factors influencing location of business investments in the city and factors influencing business growth. The study would propose a differentiated policy framework for different size-class of cities.

Analysis

Factors influencing spatial spread of urban growth:

Based on data collected at different level, the team would carry out statistical analysis using a select set of indicators pertaining to urban growth, economic structure, level of amenities and other indicators. Further, composite indices would be constructed for the socio-economic indicators. An analysis of interdependencies of these indicators using simple correlation coefficients and regression would be attempted for understanding the dynamics of urban growth. This analysis of coefficient of variations of the indicators will help in identifying the levels of dispersion across states and size class of urban centers.

Identification of Drivers of population and economic growth in urban centers:

The SoWCR 2008-09 studied causes and effects of fast growing cities in developing world between 1990 and 2000 and identified three most significant drivers: (a) economic and industrial policies and related investments in transport infrastructure and communication and trade services; (b) improvements in quality of life in cities; and (c) changes in legal and administrative status of cities (UN-HABITAT 2008-09). Identification of similar drivers for Indian cities will very useful. A range of methods to estimate the drivers of growth would be used: statistical analysis, and extensive consultations with national and local urban practitioners and academicians.

Relation between urban infrastructure and economic growth:

Adverse impact of urban infrastructure deficits on the national GDP will also be assessed. Estimation of changes in sectoral distribution of labor force in economy may be based on Census and NSS time series data. An attempt would be made to project urban incomes. India's gross outputs by various sectors may be estimated based on data from the Planning Commission and other sources of information. The gross outputs in urban areas may be projected based on data and expected rate of growth under various scenarios. The difference between two outputs will help to identify the impact of inadequate infrastructure on national GDP.

Relation between investment urban and rural sector:

The study will make an attempt to estimate marginal productivity, employment potential and investment benefits in urban and rural areas based on information available from Planning Commission and other sources.

15. Deliverables

State of Cities Report for India, policy papers, stakeholder workshops at inception and during finalization stage, training of stakeholders and launch of website.

16. Expected outcomes and related monitoring indicators and plans

The output of the project will be India SOCR and the outcome may be addressing issues that are critical for sustainable development of urban areas in the 12th Five Year Plan as well as the National Commission on Sustainable Urbanization II.

The indicators for monitoring the output of the Project are as follows:

Indicator 1: Setting up of national and state level steering committees

Indicator 2: Project website

Indicator 3: Workshops at the national and state level for development of requisite database at the national, state and city levels

Indicator 4: Inception report and templates for developing the database at state and city levels

Indicator 5: Development of database at city, state and national levels – primary and secondary

Indicator 6: Data analysis at city, state and national levels, including overview of policies and programmes

Indicator 7: Mid-term appraisal of the project in the selected states

Indicator 8: Final dissemination national workshop

Indicator 9: Finalization of draft final report and final launch of the Report.

17. Sources of investment to implement the CDS or slum-upgrading programme

Not Applicable

18. Partnerships

Partnerships with the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, Urban Development Departments in the 6 selected states, City Managers' Associations, State Training Institutes and Municipal Authorities in the selected 42 cities, UN-HABITAT, Cities Alliance, the World Bank, and World Bank Institute would be developed for the preparation of India SoCR, with committed support from Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD), Government of India.

A National Steering Committee chaired by the Joint Secretary UD, MOUD, would be constituted to monitor the project and to guide the national and state teams. The Committee may have representatives from Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission, NIUA and urban experts, researchers etc. All the interim and draft reports would be reviewed by a peer group consisting of representatives of National and International organizations.

State level City Managers' Association (CMA) and state level organizations would be responsible for data collection from the state and city level agencies and arranging the State Level Steering Committee meetings. The institutes are CMA Gujarat/Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology University (CEPT) in Gujarat, CMA Madhya Pradesh /MP Academy of Administration in Madhya Pradesh, Advanced Training Institute in Assam, CMA Karnataka / ATI Mysore in Karnataka, Institute of Local Government and Urban Studies /Institute of Social Science, Kolkata in West Bengal and All India Institute of Local Self Government, Haryana / Haryana Institute of Public Administration in Haryana. The researchers/consultants at the national institution would analyze the data and discuss the findings in the respective states and be responsible for the preparation of the SOCR. The GOI, NIUA, UN-HABITAT, Cities Alliance and the World Bank would take this opportunity to develop capacities of local, state and national institutions to carry out applied research and gain from interactions with national and international experts.

A Peer Group of urban sector experts from CA-S, WB SASDU, WBI, WB Urban Anchor, and UN Habitat would provide expert inputs to the India SoCR, particularly in data analysis and formulation of future urban strategies. There would be an in-built mechanism for consultation with stakeholders. Initial consultations may take place at the city level. At state level consultations, findings of the city and state analysis and potential policy options will be presented and participants' views ascertained. SoCRs are being prepared for several other countries like South Africa and Brazil. The India SoCR team would interact with their counterparts in these countries and learn from their experiences in managing urban growth.

19. Government commitment and approval

Attached

IMPLEMENTATION AND FINANCING PLANS:

20. Implementation arrangements

Sharing of Responsibilities among partners:

State level City Managers' Association (CMA) and state level organizations would be responsible for data collection from the state and city level agencies and arranging the State Level Steering Committee meetings. The researchers/consultants at the national institution would analyze the data and discuss the findings in the respective states and be responsible for the preparation of the SOCR .

21. Project schedule and delivery targets

TIME FRAME

The study will be completed in 18 months. The table below presents the project schedule and delivery targets

PROJECT TIME SCHEDULE																		
No.	Item	Months																
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.	Launch Workshop & Website Section	█																
2.	Approach & Inception Report	█	█															
3.	National Data Collection & Analysis		█	█	█	█	█											
4.	Identify State & Local Indicators				█	█												
5.	State and Local Data Collection & Analysis				█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█					
6.	State Level Workshops								█	█	█							
7.	Preparation of National, State, and City Level Reports								█	█	█	█	█					
8.	National Workshop														█			
9.	Finalization of Draft Final Report															█	█	█
10.	Final Report and Formal Launch																	█

22. Financing plan

A. CITIES ALIANCE GRANT REQUEST

Components / Main Activities	Total (US\$)	Type of Expenditure			
		Consulting Services	Training/ Capacity Building(US\$)	Dissemination Costs	Other
		(US\$)		(US\$)	(US\$)
PROJECT ACTIVITIES					
Component/ Activity #1 Launch Workshop & Website	55,520		49,120	6,400	
Component/ Activity #2 National, State and City level Data Collection	1,58,560	1,58,560			
Component/ Activity #3 Data Analysis and Preparation of National, State, and City Level Reports	46,080	46,080			
Component/ Activity #4 National Workshop	49,120		49,120		
Component/ Activity #5 Finalization of Draft Final Report	6,400			6,400	
Sub-Total – Project Activities	3,15,680	2,04,640	98,240	12,800	
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION & SUPERVISION					
Independent Audit (1):					
Supervision Costs (2):					
Sub-Total – Project Administration & Supervision	47,352				
TOTAL A (Cities Alliance Grant Request)	3,63,032				

B. CO-FINANCING

Co-financing Partner #1:	2,04,206				
Co-financing Partner #2:					
Co-financing Partner #3:					
TOTAL B (Co-Financing)	2,04,206				

C. TOTAL

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET COST	5,67,238				
--------------------------------------	-----------------	--	--	--	--

(A + B)

See Guidelines for more information.

(1) An external audit is required upon completion or termination of project activities. Categories this type of expenditure as “other.”

(2) Incremental costs associated with the management of the project, up to a maximum of 15 percent of the Cities Alliance grant request. Categories this type of expenditure as “other.”

Detailed cost break down required in Section 23 Costing Assumptions

23. Costing assumptions : Assumptions that were used to calculate the costs presented in the summary financing plan (22).

Item	Unit (No./Days)	Rate/lump sum	Total
Consulting services (i)	Consultant A for 42 cities (Senior) 42 Consultant B for 42 cities (Junior) 42 Consultant A for 6 States (Senior) 6 Consultant B for 6 States (Junior) 6 National Consultants A (Senior) Consultant B (Junior)	\$2500 Consultant A lump sum \$ 1500 Consultant B lump sum \$5,000 Consultant A lump sum \$ 3,000 Consultant B lump sum \$ 45,000 Consultant A lump sum \$ 27,000 Consultant B lump sum	\$2,88,000
Training/workshops/seminars	14 Workshops	\$15000per national workshop (1X2) \$5000 per state level workshop (6X2)	\$90000
Dissemination cost	Publication & Website		\$ 20000
Project Administration & Supervision and audit	Includes Travel cost to project cities		\$169238 ³
Total			\$5,67,238

24.Expected currency of expenditures

Into what currency (or currencies) do you expect the grant funding (provided in U.S. dollars) to be converted?

INR

What exchange rate assumptions have you used?

³ Includes Travel cost to project cities + \$73,988 (for project administration, supervision and audit)

Rs.50 per USD

25. Co-financing arrangements

Co-financing Source	Description of Co-Financing
1. MOUD	US\$2,04,206
2.	
3.	
4.	

Is all co-financing confirmed/committed? No

26. Additional Financial Management Information from Recipient

- b.) Is the Recipient a registered organization under the countries/cities legal requirement? - (Yes /No)
- c.) Can the recipient provide proof of registration and years of operation? -(Yes /No)
- d.) Does the recipient have prior experience managing other Donor funds and provide documentation to support this? (Yes /No)
- e.) Does the recipient have or can open a bank account?- (Yes /No)
- f.) Is the recipient audited annually? - (Yes /No)
- g.) Do you produce periodic financial reports for monitoring and evaluation? (Yes /No)

Annexures

A.1 Basis of Cost Estimates

The above calculation is based on the table given below.

Costing India SOCR

Consultants for developing database/situational analysis for 42 cities		Component/
Consultant A	\$2,500	Activity #2
Consultant B	\$1,500	National, State
Total for each city	\$4,000	and City level
		Data Collection
Total for 42 cities	\$168,000	
Consultants for developing database/situational analysis for 6 states		
Consultant A	\$5,000	
Consultant B	\$3,000	
Total for each city	\$8,000	
Total for 6 states	\$48,000	
National Consultants		Component/
Consultant A	\$45,000	Activity #3
Consultant B	\$27,000	Data Analysis
Total	\$72,000	and
		Preparation of
		National, State,
		and City Level
Total Consultants	\$288,000	Reports
Travel	\$34,500	
(126 trips to cities and 12 trips to states @ \$250 per trip)		
Subsistence/Local travel	\$60,750	

(\$75 for 15 days in each city and 30 days in each state)

Total	\$383,250
2 National Workshops	\$30,000
12 state workshops	\$60,000
Publication & website	\$20,000
Total	\$493,250
Supervision & audit	\$73,988
Total Project Cost	\$567,238
CA grant	\$365,000
Co-financing	\$202,238

The following documents are attached:

- 1. Letter of GOI(Ministry's) Interest**
- 2. Letter of Ministry's Approval**
- 3. Letter of UN-Habitat Approval**
- 4. Letter of World Bank Support**
- 5. Letter of World Bank Institute's Support**