Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project „Gdańsk cycling infrastructure and promotion project” (POL/01/G36)

2008.09.16

Aleksander Buczyński
Zielone Mazowsze
olek@zm.org.pl

List of abbreviations

CO2 - Carbon dioxide, most common “greenhouse” gas
EA - Executing Agency
EU - European Union
GEF - Global Environment Facility
IA - Implementing Agency
IO - Immediate Objective
IOO - Information and Outreach Officer
NGO - Non-Governmental Organisation
OLE - Civil Environmental League (Obywatelska Liga Ekologiczna)
PKE - Polish Ecological Club (Polski Klub Ekologiczny)
PM - Project Manager
SKZD - Cycling Consultative Team (Społeczny Zespół Konsultacyjno – Doradczy)
UMG - Municipality of Gdańsk (Urząd Miejski w Gdańsku)
UNDP - United Nations Development Program

Table of contents

Executive summary

The Project’s goal was to mitigate the motor car emissions of greenhouse gases through the implementation of facilities for non motorized traffic in the city of Gdańsk. The Project aimed to develop the infrastructure of sustainable, energy efficient transport system in Poland, support measures to prevent harmful climate change, what would result in health and safety benefits for the inhabitants and to disseminate knowledge on the Gdańsk pilot project and replicate it in other cities.

This document contains final evaluation of the project. It aims to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. The evaluation looks at signs of potential impact and sustainability of results. It also documents lessons learned and provides recommendations for follow-up or similar projects.

The Project turned out to be a huge success in benchmarking cycling infrastructure and encouraging active public participation in Poland. Although the project experienced many difficulties and delays, and not all of the objectives defined in the Project Document have been met, the results are definitely worth the money spent. The Project changed the way of thinking about cycling and cycling facilities both in Gdańsk, and whole of Poland. The outcomes are commendably sustainable, as the municipality of Gdańsk continues to invest in cycling, while representatives of other municipalities and NGOs continue to visit Gdańsk to see, believe and learn.

The Project and its focus on quality and public participation is directly replicable and very scalable. However, similar projects should make use of the experiences of Gdańsk to avoid problems and delays related to the interdependencies of infrastructure works, underestimating the costs, and financing expenses not directly related to project objectives. Additionally, more attention should be paid to low-cost cycling facilities, such as traffic calming, cycle lanes and contraflow lanes.

In Gdańsk itself, a thorough study of cycle traffic is highly recommended. Traffic counts are one of the missing outputs of the Project and without such research it is impossible to evaluate its impact on greenhouse gases emissions, as there are no data about the changes in volumes of cycle and motorised traffic.

Introduction

1. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, performance and success of the Project. It looks at the early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It also aims to identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.
2. The evaluation addresses:
   - Project formulation, including strategy, objectives, activities, stakeholder participation in design stages, scalability of the project.
   - Project implementation, including efficiency and effectiveness of activities, adaptation to changing conditions, overall project management, monitoring of the project, stakeholder participation in the project, financial planning, sustainability, execution and implementation modalities.
   - Project outputs, outcomes and impact, including significant unexpected effects.
3. The evaluation mission took place in July and August 2008, two years after the Project activities ended, five years after they started and eight years since the initial project formulation. The time gap gave an interesting perspective on the long-term Project impact and sustainability of results, but on the other hand made it difficult to reach key persons, especially those involved in the early stages of the Project. Many of them had changed jobs and living places, contact details were outdated, Project Manager had died. Also the persons reached often could not remember the details of project formulation and implementation.
4. The evaluation is focusing on the outcomes of the Project, however a lot of attention has been paid to the process, too.
5. The evaluation is based on the study of documents; interviews with the key persons involved in the project, i.e. representatives of the executing and implementing agencies, UNDP staff, the Steering Committee, other significant stakeholders; direct observations of the project outcomes. The face-to-face interviews were often followed by email correspondence or phone calls, to clarify or receive additional information. The lists of persons interviewed and documentation reviewed is provided in the annexes 1 and 3 respectively.
6. The evaluation consists of five chapters and seven annexes. This chapter serves as an introduction to the whole document. The second chapter describes the project, its duration, development context, the problems it sought to address, its objectives and main stakeholders. The third chapter includes findings and conclusions of the evaluation. The fourth chapter focuses on recommendations – both for the follow-up of this project, and for the design and implementation of

similar projects. The fifth, last chapter shortlists lessons learned -- the best and the worst practices of the project. Annexes include: Terms of Reference, list of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, co-financing and leveraged resources, photo documentation and a letter from the municipality of Gdańsk with additional explanations, including the information missing from the final report.

The project and its development context

7. The project duration was originally defined as 24 months, starting in September 2002 and ending on August 31st 2004. In fact the project started in February 2003 and ended in December 2006, lasting 47 months, nearly two times longer than expected. The investment part ended on November 30th 2005, the promotion part -- June 4th 2006. Several evaluation-related activities were planned to take place one or two years after the end of the project, but it seems they have not happened until now.
8. The overall objective of the Project was to mitigate the motor car emissions of greenhouse gases by supporting a modal shift from private cars to bicycles in urban transport. Road transport energy consumption and emissions of CO2 in Poland were growing rapidly. The share of cycling in all trips is very low, as well as the size and quality of cycling infrastructure.
9. The Project addressed both infrastructural and awareness problems, i.e.:
   - lack of safe cycling infrastructure;
   - institutional, legal, cultural and information barriers that limit bicycle use as a means of urban transport in larger cities.
10. To overcome these barriers, the Project was designed with the following specific objectives, as defined in the Project Document:
    - Promote cycling as an urban transport mode in order to avoid emissions from cars and to help a more efficient use of public transport. The project was designed to increase the share of cycling trips in Gdańsk to 5-10% of all trips until 2005.
    - Provide a working example with a one-time investment that will give people a chance to use a less polluting, energy-efficient and safe mode of transportation. The project intended to integrate new facility construction with other engineering measures, such as traffic calming and the core cycling network with public transport hubs.
    - Disseminate the experience and data collected in the project city of Gdańsk among other provinces, local governments and financial institutions focusing on environment and development. This component was designed to increase the acceptance of cycling as viable means of urban transport.
    - Monitor and evaluate transport behaviour and costs incurred to achieve greenhouse gas mitigation and other measurable benefits.
    - Develop recommendations to promote non-motorised transport at a national level and disseminate knowledge and experience gained from the Gdańsk project throughout Poland and develop recommendations to promote non-motorised transport at the national level. The project intended to develop a

factbook for modal shift enhancement, addressing all relevant data. Developing similar projects with other local authorities and environmental funding agencies should ensure sustainability.

11. Key stakeholders included:
    - Municipality of Gdańsk (IA responsible for the investment part of the project)
    - Polish Ecological Club (IA responsible for knowledge and information dissemination country-wide)
    - Civil Environmental League (Contractor responsible for cycling promotion in Gdańsk)
    - Governmental institutions, in particular:
        - Ministry of Environment (EA, responsible for the National Environmental Policy)
        - Ministry of Infrastructure / Ministry of Transport and Maritime Economy (responsible for the Transport Policy and detailed regulations concerning design of cycling facilities)
        - The National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management (able to provide funding for replication of the Project)
    - Citizens of Gdańsk
    - Traffic engineers
    - Local authorithies in medium and large cities in Poland
    - The Voivodship Funds for Environmental Protection and Water Management
    - Bicycle companies, shops and workshops
12. The most important direct beneficiaries of the project are:
    - On the local level: the general public of Gdańsk, as increased cycling yields better environment (decreases pollution and noise) and quality of life, especially for young and poor people, who have a limited choice of modes of transport;
    - On the national level:
        - local governments, assisted in developing similar projects;
        - NGOs working in the fields of cycling and transport, empowered with information and training.
13. There are many stakeholders that should benefit from the Project indirectly. These include Ministries of Infrastructure and of Environment that have their own priorities reflected within the Project, and may use the experience and

knowledge gathered during the Project to improve their programs and regulations. Local governments that try to develop environmentally sound transport policies should be provided with all the necessary data as well. The long-term output of greenhouse gasses mitigation in transport sector resulting from the Project and its replication will reduce the increasing pressure on other sectors.

14. The expected project outputs included:
    - Construction of 30,7 km of cycleways and calming traffic on 70 km of streets.
    - Increase of share of cycling in all trips in Gdańsk to 5-10%.
    - 16 workshops,
    - Leaflets, project fact book, bulletin and website, consulting centre operations.
    - Three project proposals for funding similar projects .
    - Benchmarking the cycling infrastructure.
    - Project impact measurements.
    - Traffic counts and emissions estimates.

Findings and Conclusions

Rating of the selected criteria, marked with (R) in the descriptive part, using the divisions according to GEF Project Review Criteria:

Criteria	Highly Satisfact-ory	Satisfact-ory	Marginally Satis-factory	Un-satis-factory	Not ap-plicable
Project formulation					
Conceptualization / Design		S			
Stakeholder participation	HS				
Implementation					
Implementation approach		S			
Monitoring and evaluation			MS		
Stakeholder participation	HS				
Results					
Attainment of Outcomes / Achievement of objectives	HS				

Project formulation

Conceptualization/Design (R)

15. The intervention strategy assumed by the Project aims to provide a viable alternative to car use for personal transport. Although it does not directly enforce reduction of car use, its realisation should provide a solid basis -- in areas of both infrastructure and public awareness -- for further, more direct interventions.
16. Low level of cycling use, low profile of cycling, lack of local know-how and rapidly growing motorisation formed a contextual setting different from the settings known in countries with successful cycling investment and promotion projects. The problem forms a vicious circle: low level of cycling -- lack of pressure for cycling investments -- lack of cycling facilities -- low level of cycling. The project took an innovative design with many interoperating components, aiming at different parts of the vicious circle.
17. The different project components and activities were complementary and formed a clear logical framework. The investments address the lack of infrastructure, the promotion -- low level of cycling, the knowledge transfer -- lack of know-how. Without the investments, the promotion would make no sense, without the promotion the investments would not be fully used. The knowledge transfer and replication components had a potential of multiplying the effects of the project.
18. An important lesson incorporated in the Project from the experience world-wide is focus on quality. This is reflected in the project by adopting by the municipality design standards basing on the CROW guidelines (Sign Up for the Bike, 1993), as well as constant monitoring and design evaluation.
19. Several of the indicators defined for target outputs of the Project turned out to be estimated too optimistically. It is disputable whether it is at all possible to achieve all planned outputs within the originally planned time frame of 24 months. On the other hand, stretching the project duration to a more risk-safe time frame could weaken the motivational and demonstrative effect of the Project. As there were also quite a few unplanned positive outputs of the Project, such miscalculations can be tied to the innovative and complex character of the Project.
20. The risk assessment took into account many possible threats, including for example cultural limitations and bicycle market. However, one important risk was not accounted for -- the shift of the supply-demand balance in the market of design and construction of roads. The shift could cause both delays and increase of the costs of planned works and threaten the final output.

National policies context

21. The Project formulation followed the guidelines on urban transport policies set in the New Transport Policy, adopted by the Polish Government in 2001, the National Environmental Policy and the National Strategy of Sustainable Development Until 2025. The main objective of the Project is directly related to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change ratified by Poland on 28 July 1994.

Stakeholder participation in the project (R)

22. The Project resulted from grass-root NGO activities campaigning for bicycle use as means of urban transport and their co-operation with the Municipality of Gdańsk. The Project takes advantage of existing co-operation, like the SZKD -- cycling consulting body, consisting of Municipality head officials, scientists, urban planners, and a vast representation of NGOs. Such co-operation between the authorities and a representation of the final users seems to be a key pre-requirement for transport related projects to ensure high quality and economic efficiency.
23. The existing co-operation and local resources, like cycling consulting body, Design Standard for cycling infrastructure, CO2 emissions calculations, as well as strong commitment of the NGOs, made it possible to prepare the Project in a record time without funding for the PDF A stage.
24. Some of the problems that had arisen during the implementation phase (land ownership, lack of land-use plans, poor co-ordination with other investment plans) could have been avoided by better preparation of the investments. However, in such case the preparation would have lasted much longer and it is not clear whether the municipality would have been ready at all to undergo all the preparations without the financing provided.
25. The project design pays a lot of attention to wide information dissemination between two main target groups:
    - Citizens of Gdańsk -- information about the availability of a new transport mode, benefits of cycling, possibility of influencing the shape and quality of cycling network.
    - Local authorities, NGOs and engineers across all Poland - the technical and managing know-how generated by the project, from cycle path surfacing construction to cycle audit procedures.
26. The Ministry of Infrastructure expressed written interest in the Project as a pilot project, and in making use of the experiences and knowledge gathered.
27. It is worth noting that the final stage of preparations for the Project application took place after a disastrous flood in Gdańsk (July 2001). The fact that the Project has not been abandoned by the municipality in the name of more pressing reconstruction tasks is a proof of strong local political commitment for

the objectives of the Project.

28. The interdependencies between cycling infrastructure quality assurance, construction and promotion contribute to strengthening the partnership between the municipality of Gdańsk and NGOs. The good practice and demonstrative effects of the project could also play an important role in forming similar partnerships in other cities.

Replication approach

29. The replication of the Project was one of its direct objectives. The experiences of the Project are directly replicable in similar projects in medium and large cities, at least in Eastern European countries.
30. The Project can also be easily scaled up in two main directions:
    - into a governmental or European Union programme of innovative, pilot cycling investments;
    - into a wider scale cycling investment programme within Gdańsk (as proven by the new Tri-City cycling investment project).

Role of UNDP

31. One of the key problems addressed by the Project was low profile of cycling in Poland, typical for developing agrarian countries. Support from UNDP, an international organisation with widely recognised reputation, has a strong potential of overcoming this barrier and changing the perception of cycling, especially by local and national decision-makers.
32. Because of the timing of the Project, it could serve as a pilot project not only in cycling investments, but also in better preparing Poland for European Union funds absorption. Strict bookkeeping and reporting rules, exchange rate risks etc. made the funding different than the local funds Polish municipalities and NGOs were used to.
33. On the other hand, several people stated an opinion that the amount of „bureaucracy" was disproportional to the amount of funds. The preparations and reporting were basically as complex and time-consuming as for large GEF projects, with much lower benefits.

Management arrangements

34. The management arrangements seem to have been too complex for the tight time schedule of the Project. Especially the monitoring responsibilities of UNDP, Ministry of Environment and Project Manager turned out to be partially overlapping. The indirect reporting and finance flows increased the risk of

delays.

35. The responsibility for the evaluation of the Project was distributed too. The evaluation system should have been developed by the Project team; the responsibility for evaluating the Project as a whole was assigned to the Steering Committee; once a year a trilateral (but with only two stakeholders – government and UNDP – explicitly listed) evaluation should have taken place. Reports from the evaluation were meant to be an important source of information for other organisations, but it seems rather overlapping with direct outputs of the Project, especially Outputs 3, 5, 6 and 7.

36. Terms of Reference, defined in the Annex 6 to the Project Document, described precisely duties and responsibilities of the Project Team members. However, the management tools they have to execute their duties seems to have been underspecified.

    During the Project implementation, a question was often raised whether a position of Project Manager is necessary at all, but it is not clear whether the problem lay in management arrangements or in recruitment process.

37. The strong point of the decision-making scheme was the Steering Committee, grouping relevant decision-makers and independent experts, with a representation of the involved NGOs. The Steering Committee replicated and scaled up to the national level the best practices of the local cycling consulting body.

Implementation

Implementation approach (R)

38. The main challenge during the implementation of the project were the delays in cycling facilities design and construction. The reasons for these problems included: land ownership disputes, lack of land-use plans, lengthy procedures of preparing the technical documentation, co-ordination of cycling infrastructure with other city investment plans, higher than expected costs of cycling infrastructure in the city centre and the rise of costs of construction works in general.
39. Taking into account that some of the problems were related to the innovative nature of the Project (introducing cycling facilities in the city centre, new surfacing technology) and some resulted from the unpredictable changes in the context (rising costs of constructions works, decreasing value of dollar), the Steering Committee agreed to prolong the investment part by one year and to change the list of cycling paths to be constructed within the scope of the project.
40. There was also a significant communication problem at the beginning of the project, which either resulted from a clash of corporate culture of UNDP structures and grassroot character of NGOs involved or changes in UNDP staff. Although the Project was formulated mainly by NGOs, they were not involved in taking important decisions at the early stages of the Projects, for example recruitment or position placement of the Project Manager. The results of the decisions lead to a conclusion that some of the involved key persons displayed poor understanding of the Project Document, especially the logical and time framework.
41. The delays and necessary limitations of cycling infrastructure (Output 1 of the Project) heavily influenced the implementation of other Project components. Outputs 2-7, to be produced by PKE and OLE, were based on disseminating information about Output 1 and impact measurements of it. Lack of an object to promote / disseminate information about forced delays in the implementation and reduced the demonstrative impact of the project.
42. In the later stages of the Project, there were controversies and disputes, especially between the municipality of Gdańsk and OLE, about the range of changes in the investment part of the Project and technical details of the designs, but the operational relationships between the institutions involved were generally good. It is important to note the mediating role of Steering Committee and the commitment of Ministry of Environment staff to facilitate the Project. However it seems that most of the communication took place outside of the official project structure.
43. The promotion component of the logical framework had to be heavily modified during implementation, too. Apart from the delays in infrastructure construction

(ie. lack of object to promote), changing conditions included for example:

- public perception of direct mailing campaigns;
- arrangements with outdoor companies.

The changes introduced were oriented on maximising the efficiency of the funds, giving up activities with increased costs (billboards) and reduced impact (direct mail), and reallocating the funds to the Great Bike Rides at the end of the project, when the results of the investment component were most visible.

44. A lot of project related communication between IAs has been done via email. The technical design and evaluation of investments was reported on the project webpage. However there seems to have been a gap in the use of electronic information technologies between NGOs and municipalities. Email arrangements with the local administrations often had to be followed by phone calls or faxes.

Monitoring and evaluation (R)

45. The monitoring of progress focused on the investment component of the Project. Although PKE reported on regular basis to the Steering Committee on information dissemination, and there were changes in comparison to the original logical framework, there were mostly left uncommented. The reporting by OLE was less regular, but it did not raise any special controversies either. It seems that the Steering Committee and the Executing Agency assumed that the NGOs are competent enough in their fields and gave them freedom in choosing the right activities leading to achieving the Project objectives.
46. Within the investment component, the focus was clearly on the segregated cycling paths. Progress of traffic calming was monitored less strictly, and the quality of its technical details – very occasionally, if ever.
47. The project aimed to create benchmarks for cycling infrastructure. Therefore monitoring the quality of the designs and construction was crucial for Project goals. The designs were created with focus on quality and really changed the way of thinking about cycling infrastructure in Poland. For example nearly all of cycling paths in Poland before the Project were surfaced with small concrete blocks, raising the resistance and energy expenditure, therefore reducing the competitiveness of cycling as a mode of transport. After the cycling paths in Gdańsk were built, other cities – Cracow, Warsaw, Wrocław – started to use asphalt surfacing as well. Another innovation which spread to other cities was raising the cycle crossings through local streets, therefore forcing the incoming vehicles to slow down and increasing the cyclists safety. For more examples see 90—91.
48. However, it seems that in the later stages of the project, the monitoring of the financed investments was relaxed. OLE did not have full access to the technical

and financial documentation and the Project Manager did not enforce proper monitoring. The quality of the designs was still good, at the benchmark level for Poland, but had stopped improving. A few mistakes have been made, for example: changing the type of grid covering tree roots from metal to a concrete one, which turned out to be less comfortable for cyclists (both kinds can be found along Grunwaldzka street); making the cycling path along Wyspiańskiego street unnecessarily cross the road twice. .

49. There was also a huge discussion on the eligibility of costs of works related to the investments, but not directly influencing the quality of cycling infrastructure, such as pavement, underground infrastructure (water, sewage, gas, electricity), traffic lights, parking places for cars, small architecture, decorative plants.
50. From the point of view of the municipality, excluding this kind of works would mean an inefficient use of public money, because contracting them separately would require commissioning separate designs, separate construction works and possibly damaging the constructed cycling paths (especially the modernisation of sewage or electricity system after a cycling path had been constructed would have damaged the high quality surfacing). Another argument raised was that for example a modernisation of pavement is necessary to avoid pedestrian traffic on the cycling path, and similarly parking bays – to avoid car parking.
51. On the other hand, the budget was calculated on the basis of cycling paths only, and spending the money on pavements and bushes significantly reduced the amount of cycling paths constructed.
52. It should be noted that including all such costs in a cycling infrastructure project, with key goals and indicators clearly based on modal shift, decrease the economic feasibility and efficiency of the project. The problem was again a subject of dispute between the municipality and the authors of a feasibility study for the new Tri-City cycling infrastructure project.
53. Until now, there have not been any attempts to monitor and evaluate the indirect -- but easily measurable -- effects of the project, such as changes in the volume of cycling traffic and the coverage of the promotion. This seems to be the weakest point of the Project implementation (see also Results). A limited scale bicycle traffic count was done for the Feasibility Study of the new Tri-City cycling project, but it covered only roads where new investments are planned (not these, where cycling paths had been built during the Project) and the numbers are very approximate.
54. There have been a few attempts to monitor bicycle accidents, but the indicators used and conclusions drawn are not consistent. Mr. Szczyt in his presentation reported a 63% increase in number of injured cyclists between 1999 and 2004, and the aforementioned Feasibility Study – 67% decrease in number of accidents with cyclists between 2004 and 2006. It could be that the initial increase is related to the increase in number of cyclists, while the later decrease – to drivers getting used to cyclists on the road, but its only one of possible interpretations.

A detailed, consistent analysis of bicycle accidents and collisions would provide a valuable data about the influence of the Project. The municipality plans a public debate about cycling safety for September 2008.

55. There are a few inconsistencies between the reports, but most of them seem to be quite minor. For example according to the final report of the municipality of Gdańsk (Implementing Agency), 16.644 km of cycling paths were built, while according to the final report of the Ministry of Environment (Executing Agency) -- 15.5 km.

56. The only significant difference between the reports is in the total length of streets with traffic calming measures. The municipality of Gdańsk reported 70 km, while the Ministry of Environment -- only 30 km. The discrepancy could not been explained or verified during the evaluation mission. It seems that the annex 2 to the report by the municipality of Gdańsk, listing the streets with traffic calming applied, has been removed from the final report by the Ministry of Environment. The explanations of the municipality, including the list, are enclosed as an annex to this document.

Stakeholder participation (R)

57. Several project components were focused clearly on production and dissemination of information. The public participation and public awareness campaign carried out by OLE involved consulting the local communities and relevant industries. The information dissemination performed by PKE included the creation of knowledge-transfer instruments, workshops and co-operation with NGOs.

58. Additionally, the Best Practices in cycling infrastructure created during the project continue to attract the interest of municipalities, NGOs and traffic engineers across Poland and neighbouring countries. Representatives of various institutions -- from non-formal cycling advocacy groups to city authorities -- are visiting Gdańsk to learn how to co-operate and design good cycling infrastructure. People involved in the project are being invited to workshops and conferences to share their experiences.

59. The most important national and international conferences the Project was presented on included:

- Velo.Info, February 2002, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- National Road Conference, May 2004, Lublin, Poland
- World Conference on Transport Research, July 2004, Istanbul, Turkey
- Velo City, May/June 2005, Dublin, Ireland

60. Additionally, Mr. Szczyt during the last few years gave presentations in Kielce, Suwałki, Szczecin, Bydgoszcz, Olsztyn and Vienna. Mr. Hyła -- in Warszawa

and Tarnowskie Góry.

61. The Project was featured three times on the channel 3 of the national TV (TVP3) in programme „Niezła Jazda" (Good Ride) with an average audience of 600,000 .
62. The Cities for Bicycles network has been a particularly important channel of dissemination of information. The network gathers NGOs working in the area of bicycle advocacy and the Project serves as an example of Good Practice in many local cycling campaigns.
63. It should be noted that the cycling advocacy movement is fairly weak in Poland. Most cycling associations are cycling and sporting clubs. Strong NGOs like OLE, able to start dialogue with the municipality, review technical designs and carry out such project are rare. Lack of similar organisations in Sopot and Gdynia seem to be a weak point of the follow-up project.
64. In addition to the relationships defined by the Project document, OLE has established a collaborative relationship with the University of Gdańsk. The benefits are mutual -- the students are very good target group for cycling campaigns, and cyclists, out of whom many are young people, are good group for recruiting students for the university.
65. Despite the letter of intention at the stage of Project formulation, the Ministry of Transport / Infrastructure did not make any attempts to make use of the experiences of the Project, for example to update the regulations for cycling path construction according to design standards in Gdańsk.
66. The willingness of other governmental institutions to learn from Gdańsk was slightly disappointing too. The funding provided in the subsequent years for cycling infrastructure did not have the extremely important focus on quality and many of the investments in Poland financed for example from the EU funds, turned out to be useless and dangerous because of poor design.

Financial planning

67. The comparison of planned and actual disbursements is summarised in a tabular form in the annex “Co-financing and Leveraged Resources“. The GEF financing was spent as planned. The local government co-financing exceeded the plans by 140%, but the amount includes works not directly related to the Project, as discussed in 49—52. Separating the costs would require additional research.
68. The financial context changed unfavourably during the time of the Project implementation. First, on May 1st 2004 VAT on construction works increased from 7% to 22%. Secondly, the value of US dollar dropped by more than 25% during the time of the project -- from more than 4 PLN to less than 3 PLN.
69. Additionally, the costs of construction of cycling infrastructure in the centre of the city have been severely underestimated, which resulted in halving the final

output of cycling paths built (see Outputs).

70. In accordance with the UNDP guidelines, subsequent payments could have been done only after 75% of the previous rate of the money had been used. The Project was different from typical projects with a single Implementing Agency, because of the two separate IAs (UMG and PKE) and an additional contractor (OLE). Initially, the rule was applied to each of the beneficiaries separately, but in 2005, because of significant differences in progress, UNDP decided to apply the rule to all beneficiaries altogether to encourage co-operation towards timely implementation of all Project components.

71. Because of the delays in cycle path construction, the rates assigned to the municipality of Gdańsk was not spent in the planned time. This stopped the financial flows not only to the municipality, but also to OLE and PKE. Although sensible from the point of the logical framework (promotion and information dissemination should follow the investments) and theoretically motivating to co-operation, it put a lot of strain on OLE and PKE.

    The delays made financing of various activities unstable and concentrating in the very last part of the Project. This lack of continuity caused problems for example with funding administrative costs and project staff. Staff members were forced to find work in other projects or even outside their NGO. This in turn resulted in problems with resuming the activities after the financial flow had been restored.

72. OLE reported that the exchange rates assumed by the UNDP and policies concerning VAT refund were ambiguous, which made exact financial planning difficult. Additional confusion was created by the new budget management system introduced in UNDP in 2004.

Results

Attainment of Outcomes/Achievement of objectives (R)

73. Although some of the immediate objectives seem to have been set too optimistically, the Project definitely became a breakthrough in cycling infrastructure and promotion, both on the local and the national level.

IO A: model system of cycling facilities in Gdańsk.

Output 1: construction of 30,7 km of cycleways and 70 km of traffic-calmed streets in Gdańsk.

74. According to different reports, between 15.5 and 16.6 km of segregated cycleways were built in Gdańsk. The traffic calming was reported on 30 or 70 km of streets, but it seems quite hard to determine the exact length and location of the streets.
75. The reduction of amount of cycling paths built from 30 to 15-16 kilometers was quite significant. Opinions on the impact of this change on cohesion of the network and achieving other project goals vary -- some state that the most important parts of the network were build, some -- that the quality, not the quantity matters, other reckon that the critical mass of cycling infrastructure has not been reached.
76. The most important cycling facility output in Gdańsk is the cycling path along the Grunwaldzka street, the main axis of the Tri-City. As for now, together with older and newer developments, it starts at the border of neighbouring Sopot, crosses the centres of Oliwa and Wrzeszcz quarters, and continues until the main train station and the historical centre of the city, totalling approximately 10 km. This is an achievement unique on the scale of Eastern Europe, as cycling paths are usually short and avoid the city centres, where construction is much more complex than on the outskirts.
77. Other important achievements include paths along Kościuszki and Legionów streets, where high quality (resulting from strict monitoring of design standards) and carefully thought location (densely populated quarters of Wrzeszcz) contribute to their usefulness.
78. On the other hand, some of the paths created did not fully meet the expectations of the cyclists and the city administration is not very proud of them either. For example the path along Długie Ogrody was designed in a temporary manner (mostly reusing existing surface of pavements and parking bays), because a complete reconstruction of the street had been planned. However, the reconstruction has not taken place until now, and after four years the route is still in „temporary state". Further on, on Siennicka street, small concrete blocks were

used instead of asphalt because of the historical surrounding, and it reduces the comfort of the ride.

79. The traffic calming on local streets is noticeable and certainly contributes to the general traffic safety in Gdańsk. However the potential of using streets with calmed traffic to extend the coverage of cycling network seems to be not realised. Cyclists do not recognise such streets as parts of the network and do not find them useful in daily travels.

IO B: Social behaviour change - shift from motorised modes to cycling

Output 2 -- Cycling on the rise (target: it constitutes 5-10% of all trips in Gdańsk)

80. Basically everyone interviewed agreed that the number of cyclists in Gdańsk has increased significantly, but no one was able to give any concrete numbers, even crude estimations. However, the fact that the same share of trips (10%) is given within the feasibility study for a new cycling investment project as a target for 2015, indicates that the immediate objective of the Project has not been reached yet.

81. On the other hand, the number of participants of Great Bicycle Rides (up to 10.000, 2% of population of Gdańsk) and number of emails with feedback received by OLE (nearly 1600) proves that the project succeeded in reaching the general public and establishing two-way public communication.

IO C: Project becomes a blueprint for other potential beneficiaries nationwide.

Output 3: 16 workshops, leaflets, project factbook, bulletin and website, consulting centre operational.

82. The webpages describing the knowledge and experiences of the project were created in 2002 and updated on regular basis between 2002 and 2004. The pages describe the history of the Project, its objectives, structure, the importance of public participation, examples of implemented cycling facilities, problems, chances for further development and an offer of co-operation for municipalities and local NGOs.

83. PKE provided 14 workshops for local authorithies and NGOs, in Płock, Kraków, Wrocław, Nowa Sól, Przemyśl, Opole, Nowy Sącz, Szczecin, Olsztyn, Kielce, Bydgoszcz, Poznań, Warszawa and Częstochowa. The topics of the workshops included the formulation of the Project, its successes, problems with implementation and possibilities of its replication. The number of participants of each workshop varied between 20 and 70.

84. The project factbook („Rowerowy Gdańsk, Rowerowa Polska" ISBN 83-89354-01-02), was published in 2006 in 5000 copies. It describes the experiences of the project, the benchmarks in cycling facilities and necessary changes in legal

regulations to allow further improvements of conditions for cycling.

IO D: Project Replication

Output 4: Three project proposals for funding projects similar to the Gdańsk one.

85. Applications to three different funders for projects similar to the Gdańsk one were prepared by the municipality of Kraków with support from the Project team. Unfortunately, none of them was successful, mostly because of limited possibilities of funding cycling infrastructure within existing programs.
86. On request of the Ministry of Transport, Project team prepared a draft of a national cycling policy. The policy included a number of proposals of funding schemes for projects similar to the Gdańsk one within sectoral and regional European Union funds.
87. Another, different from the one developed in Gdańsk, but important source of financing cycling infrastructure is Cycle Audit -- a procedure for using the opportunities created by other investments to improve conditions for cycling, proposed by the Project team in response to the unsuccessful funding applications and taking into account the experiences of the Project concerning the interdependencies of infrastructure works. During the Project time frame, Cycle Audit was implemented in Kraków, and proved to be very economically efficient.
88. Inspired by the example of Gdańsk, Kraków and -- to a lesser extent -- Wrocław implemented several pieces of cycling infrastructure that can serve as benchmarks as well. These include new cycling paths, contraflow lanes, bike racks in the city centre.
89. The Project is currently replicated on a much larger scale within the Tri-City of Gdańsk, Sopot and Gdynia. The Gdańsk Multi-year Investment Programme for the years 2008-12 reserves 80 mln for construction of cycling paths. The new cycling investment project contains plans for construction or modernisation of 130 km of segregated cycling paths (90 km in Gdańsk, 30 km in Gdynia and 10 km in Sopot). The costs of the new project are estimated to 130 mln PLN. According to the final report and to the interviews with representatives of the municipality, the plans were directly stimulated by the success of the Project and the subsequent pressure from the citizens of Gdańsk for further improvement of the cycling infrastructure. The influence is quite clear, as no other Polish agglomeration has a cycling investment programme matching this scale. Also, the design standards of the new project are a revised version of the Gdańsk design standards used in the old Project.

IO E: project results verification and evaluation

Output 5: Benchmarking the cycling infrastructure

90. Many of the cycling solutions developed thank to the Project can serve as a benchmark. These include:
    - new surfacing technology for segregated cycling paths (most of the new lanes in Gdańsk, some in Kraków),
    - geometry of most of the new cycling paths, allowing smooth and fluent flow of bicycle traffic,
    - location of cycling infrastructure, facilitating cycle traffic on the most important relations to the city centre,
    - traffic lights programs eliminating the risk of collision between bicycle and car traffic (Grunwaldzka / Braci Lewoniewskich crossing),
    - successful segregation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic in key places,
    - contraflow lanes in Kraków and Wrocław,
    - cycle racks in Gdańsk, Kraków and Wrocław.
91. The process of planning, designing and implementing cycling infrastructure can be a benchmark, too. The benchmarks in organisational solutions and procedures include:
    - introduction of cycling into planning documents;
    - design standards for cycling infrastructure;
    - public participation in decision-making (cycling consulting team);
    - cycle audit of road investments.

Output 6: Project impact measurement (mid-term)

92. Opinion polls and focus groups were mentioned in the Project Document, but it seems that no specific budget position was provided for them, and they have not been done until now.
93. The feedback received by OLE is actually used to correct the flaws in infrastructure development, for example by selecting the worst piece of cycling infrastructure through public voting and redesigning it.

Output 7: Traffic counts and emissions estimates

94. According to the Project Document, traffic counts with special attention to cycling should have been done one year after the project end, and greenhouse mitigation estimates – two years later. Until now, no such counts have been done. The last data about the share of cycling in total number of trips come from 1998, that is before the start of the Project. The municipality of Gdańsk

plans to order traffic counts in Spring 2009.

95. Without such data, it is impossible to estimate the achievement of the main project objective, i.e. the greenhouse gasses mitigation.

Sustainability of results

The benefits of the project continue now and will continue long after its end:

96. In Gdańsk itself the perception of cycling and cycling infrastructure has changed. The cycling paths built within the project are widely used for everyday and leisure trips, reducing the CO2 emissions. New cycling paths are built every year, and the municipality pays attention to take into account the needs of cyclists in road projects. Long term cycling investments plans are made and financing them seems to be an important priority for the city.

97. The importance of cycling for citizens of Gdańsk and local politicians is reflected for example in the new Development Strategy for Gdańsk, in which the increase of length of cycling network constitutes one of the objectives.

98. The success of the project motivated neighbouring cities – particularly Sopot, Gdynia, Tczew – to create own cycling plans, and in the case of Sopot and Gdynia - to join efforts to create a common, coherent network of cycling path in the agglomeration.

99. Across the whole Poland and some of the neighbouring countries Gdańsk serves as an example of Best Practice in cycling infrastructure design and construction. Representatives of municipalities, NGOs and traffic engineers continue to visit Gdańsk to learn how to design and build good cycling infrastructure. Recent visits included representatives of Tarnowskie Góry county, "Rowerowy Toruń" ("Cycling Toruń") NGO and a cycling organisation from Belarus.

100. The tradition of Great Bicycle Rides in June is continued every year, despite the Project end.

101. The consulting centre continues to offer workshops on planning and designing cycling infrastructure, as well as studial works for towns, cities and regions. Recent works include for example local cycling plan for Wieliczka, a workshop on creating a cycling strategy for Tarnowskie Góry county, and an analysis of needs of cycle tourism in małopolskie voivodship.

Contribution to skill developement

102. The technical and organisational solutions introduced by the Project were a milestone in the know-how about cycling facilities design for the staff of the municipality of Gdańsk, and to lesser extent – for traffic engineers in whole Poland.

103. The successes of the Project contributed also to the development of

cycling advocacy movement in Poland. The experiences gathered during the Project and disseminated within the Cities for Bicycles network greatly improved the knowledge of NGOs working in the field of cycling promotion, but also their self-confidence, as they received a working proof that their activities lead to achieving objectives.

104. Persons involved in the Project implementation, both from the municipality of Gdańsk and from the involved NGOs, are now the best experts in Poland in the area of cycling infrastructure.

Recommendations

Recommendations for similar projects

105. Two years seem to be not enough for such project. Given the current legal context, it is a very tight schedule for design and construction of the infrastructure only, and most of promotion and information dissemination should be done after the construction is completed.

106. If similar project are to be realised in the future, the problem of costs of related infrastructure works - such as reconstruction of pavement or modernisation of traffic lights – should be addressed. On the one hand separating these works from the construction of cycle paths would lead to inefficient use of public money (from the point of view of the municipality) or decreasing the quality of the cycling path, on the other – expenses directly related to project goals should be given a clear priority. This could be for example by having the costs clearly separated and with different degrees of required co-financing.

107. In project design more attention should be paid to diverse kinds of cycling facilities. For example the Guidelines for Cycle Audit and Cycle Review, published by the United Kingdom Department for Transport, recommend the following hierarchy of measures to select the appropriate design solution:

- Traffic reduction
- Traffic calming
- Junction treatment and traffic management
- Redistribution of the carriageway
- Off-road provision

Although in many cases segregated cycling facilities may be the only appropriate solution, they should be treated as the last, not the first resort. As demonstrated in the case of the contraflow lane in Kraków, sometimes significant improvement in conditions for cycling can be attained by 10% of costs of building an off-road cycle path.

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits

108. A thorough study of cycle traffic in Gdańsk is highly recommended. The study could include for example:

- cycle traffic measurements, including daily and seasonal fluctuations and a comparison with the general journey matrix,

- a detailed analysis of bicycle accidents,
- a comparison of actual usage of technical solutions between the cycling paths built during the project, older and newer ones.

109. Such study would provide data for and support:

- full evaluation of the benefits of the project,
- spreading the good practice and innovative technical solutions,
- more precise assessment of impact of similar project in the future,
- determining future directions for cycling infrastructure development both in Gdańsk and in other cities.

110. As not all of the cycling paths planned for the project have been completed and the cycling network is far from covering 100% of sources and targets of journeys, further development of cycle paths is necessary, especially the paths cancelled from the original Project. This recommendation is fully met by the new Tri-City cycling investment project.

111. The development should be followed by further promotion and construction of accompanying infrastructure, for example bike racks on main streets, bike lockers at the train stations, signposting etc.

112. The main goal of the project involved a modal shift from personal cars to non-motorised transport. The most successful approaches in this field combine disincentives to use private cars and incentives to use more environmentally friendly alternatives. The core network of cycle facilities, constructed up until now, can be considered an incentive for cycling. To reinforce the benefits of the project, measures to reduce the car use should be taken as well. The measures could for example include:

- reducing the capacity of roads and crossings, especially in the areas well equipped with cycling facilities or where narrowing the road is necessary to provide continuity of cycling facilities,
- extending car-free zone in the centre of the city, creating a new one in the centre of Wrzeszcz,
- wider coverage / higher parking fees,
- wider use of traffic calming measures.

Proposals for future directions

113. Involvement of independent NGOs representing the final users perspective, able to constructively criticise technical designs, should be a pre-requisite for transportation related projects, to ensure proper quality of the project.

114. GEF should consider encouraging more realistic formulation of project document and objectives. Projects can be either highly innovative and with synergistic effects or precise in output prediction. Meeting both criteria at the same time is more a matter of luck than careful planning.

Lessons learned

Best practice	Worst practice
– High level of public participation in project formulation and implementation, including readiness of the municipality to accept this level of public participation in their investments. – Cycling paths along Grunwaldzka (the main axis of the Tri-City), Kościuszki and Legionów streets. The best practice combines carefully thought localisation, high level of public participation in technical design, paying attention to details of design and construction, as well as determination of all involved parties to combat arising challenges. – Practical evaluation and further development of design standards for cycling infrastructure to take into account the experiences of the Project. – The annual Great Bicycle Rides, particularly the ones in 2004 and 2006, with thousands of participants and good media coverage. The active participation of the president of the city in the event and the public debates accompanying the Rides make them serve not only promotion, but also communication between city authorities and the final users of the infrastructure. – Project continuation, in the form of further investments in cycling facilities. The city takes consistent actions to build the missing parts of the network, and a new, much bigger cycle infrastructure project in co-operation with neighbouring cities, is under development.	– The delays in project implementation, which reduced its demonstrative impact and caused a lot of organisational difficulties. – Frequent changes in UNDP and Executing Agency affecting the Project. – Weak position and poor performance of the Project Manager. This can be tied to the lack of involvement of NGOs during the start-up phase of the Project, in particular recruitment of the PM and establishing his position. – The reduction of amount of cycling paths built from 30 to 15 kilometres, especially with respect to financing investments not directly related to Project objectives (pavements, parking bays etc.) – Parts of the cycle network that did not meet the assumed design standards, i.e. along Cienista, Wyspiańskiego, Siennicka.

Annexes

List of persons interviewed

Date	Name	Organisation	Position in the Project
2008.07.18	Antoni Szczyt	Municipality of Gdańsk	Director of Municipal Management Department, Member of the Steering Committee
2008.07.18	Elżbieta Kocęba	Municipality of Gdańsk	Project coordinator
2008.07.19	Michał Błaut	OLE	Project coordinator
2008.07.22	Dr. Tadeusz Kopta	PKE, General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways	1. Workshop lecturer 2. Author of the feasibility study for the new Tri-City cycling investment project
2008.07.23	Marcin Hyła	PKE	Information and Outreach Officer , Member of the Steering Committee
2008.07.23	Elżbieta Pietraszko	Ministry of Environment	Secretary of the Steering Committee
2008.07.24	Prof. Wojciech Suchorzewski	Warsaw University of Technology	Member of the Steering Committee
2008.08.06	Przemysław Czajkowski	UNDP/GEF	GEF/SGP National Coordinator, Member of the Steering Committee
2008.08.12	Karolina Kukulska (Napieralska)	UNDP/GEF	GEF Assistant (medium and large grants), Member of the Steering Committee

Summary of field visits

Date	Site	Purpose
2008.07.18-19	Gdańsk	Interviews with representatives of Municipality of Gdańsk and OLE, Visit to the developments in Gdańsk
2008.07.22-23	Kraków	Interviews with representatives of PKE, Visit to the developments in Kraków

List of documents reviewed

1. Medium-sized Project Brief – Gdańsk Cycling Infrastructure Project. 2000.
2. Project Document – Gdańsk Cycling Infrastructure and Promotion Project. 2002.
3. Standardy techniczne dla infrastruktury rowerowej Miasta Krakowa (Technical standards for cycling infrastructure in Kraków). Marcin Hyła, 2004.
4. Raport z Audytu za okres od 1 stycznia do 31 grudnia 2004. BDO Polska, 2005.
5. Rowerowy Gdańsk, Rowerowa Polska. Gdański Rowerowy Projekt Inwestycyjno-Promocyjny 2002-2006. PKE, 2006.
6. Miasta dla Rowerów (Cities for Bicycles). http://www.rowery.org.pl
7. Portal Gdańskiej Kampanii Rowerowej (Gdańsk Cycling Campaign). http://www.rowery.gdansk.pl
8. Raport dotyczący realizacji Gdańskiego Rowerowego Projektu Inwestycyjno Promocyjnego (including notes from the Steering Committee meetings). Ministerstwo Środowiska, 2006.
9. Raport podsumowujący realizację Gdańskiego Rowerowego Projektu Inwestycyjno Promocyjnego. Urząd Miejski w Gdańsku, 2005.
10. Raport dotyczący realizacji Gdańskiego Rowerowego Projektu Inwestycyjno Promocyjnego. OLE, 2006.
11. Raport dotyczący realizacji Gdańskiego Rowerowego Projektu Inwestycyjno Promocyjnego. PKE, 2006.
12. Studium Wykonalności Projektu pn.: „Rozwój Komunikacji Rowerowej Aglomeracji Trójmiejskiej w latach 2007-2013” (Feasibility Study of Project “Development of Cycle Transport in the Tri-City 2007-2013”). Nizielski & Borys Consulting, 2007.
13. Lists of cycling accidents in Gdańsk, 2004 and 2005.
14. Letter WGK-IV-7045/238/08/EK from the municipality of Gdańsk concerning the final evaluation of the Gdańsk Cycling Infrastructure and Promotion Project, dated 2008.08.19.