CORPORATE SCORECARD 2018
CITIES WITHOUT SLUMS
I. Cities Alliance Results-based System

BACKGROUND

As per its Charter, the main objective of the Cities Alliance is to reduce urban poverty, and promote the role of cities in sustainable development. To assess the extent to which its efforts and those of partners are making progress toward that objective, the Cities Alliance monitors, evaluates and publicly reports its activities within an agreed-upon corporate performance and results framework and through a dedicated result-based management system.

Corporate Scorecard. At the core of Cities Alliance’s reporting system is the Corporate Scorecard, which serves as a summary of the organisation’s overall results and performance for 2018 and as a report to the Management Board. The scorecard provides Cities Alliance Secretariat and members with information on the achievement of development results, effectiveness in achieving those results, and the efficiency of the operations. It also supports strategic planning to fill crucial gaps, foster learning and corrective actions, and promote accountability for results. The scorecard relies on 42 selected indicators to help measure and document progress and performance at the portfolio level across the various tiers of results at different intervals of time. The scorecard indicators aggregate information from the various programmes. The indicators are core, meaning they have standard definitions and each programme is required to report on them.
The Tiers. The scorecard’s structure and logic reflects the Cities Alliance Results Framework, which articulates the different tiers of results expected by Cities Alliance interventions. It lays out the products and services that will be delivered over a period of time (Tier IV), the changes these products and services will generate in the short/medium time (Tier III), the effect on the main clients (Tier II), and the overall influence on the national and global developmental goals (Tier I). The vertical progression across tiers approximates the chronological and causal or logical progression across a result chain: from inputs to outputs, intermediate outcomes, outcomes and impact. It should be noted that, for corporate-wide aggregating exercises, this vertical progression – which is different from project logframes – should be considered neither scientific nor attributable.

Our Role. Different attribution vs. contribution approaches apply in relation to the various tiers. The Cities Alliance Secretariat is responsible, and should be held accountable, for effectively delivering Tier IV. These input/output levels form the basis of the Terms of Reference of the Cities Alliance Secretariat. At Tier III, the Secretariat has a direct (when implementing) and/or shared responsibility with its international and country institutions (when financing partner organisation) to deliver the desired change. Attribution of results can be established to a reasonable degree. Moving further up the chain, the level of control decreases, and the attribution gap and risk increase. Tier II is the core of the organisation and its reason for being. However, results as this level are delivered primarily by client cities and communities with the support of the Cities Alliance, members and partners. They are partly beyond the control of the Cities Alliance, and as such only contribution factors – if any – can be established. Tier I results and progress are well beyond the control of the Cities Alliance, and the improvements observed in Tier I indicators are rather the outcome of collective efforts by countries and their development partners. However, since development effectiveness is more than a ‘flag-planting’ exercise, it is in the Cities Alliance’s interest (and that of development in general) to track progress against the macro context.

TIERS EXPLAINED

Tier I. Development Goals. As per standard international practice, this tier is primarily contextual and reports on the long-term development goals that partner countries are achieving. The universe of measurement is the priority countries where Cities Alliance has long-term engagements. Developmental impact is measured in terms of a subset of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), i.e. those which relate most to the Cities Alliance mission and livelihood of the target population – the urban poor – across three aspects: poverty, tenure and gender representation. It is important to include Tier I in the Results Framework to encapsulate Cities Alliance interventions within the broader developmental picture and define what the organisation is ultimately trying to influence.

Tier II. Client Results. This level reports on the clients’ results as promoted, supported and/or influenced by the Cities Alliance. The city (broadly defined) is the client of the Cities Alliance. In fact, the Cities Alliance provides technical assistance services and demonstration projects. It also facilitates the leverage of financing that helps cities be more effective, participatory, and able to deliver improved, responsive services to the urban poor. Partner cities and national governments are the primary parties responsible for results at this level.

Tier III. Cities Alliance Programmatic Results. This tier covers the results of the Cities Alliance’s programme activities. Through the Secretariat, its members and partners, the Cities Alliance provides technical assistance support for upstream diagnostics, planning, and policy advice and development. It also supports long-term institutional strengthening and capacity development by engaging and investing
in national, regional, local and community institutional structures, including universities. Cities Alliance contributes to infrastructure development in slums, typically delivered through community engagement and dedicated funds. Specific attention is paid downstream to project preparation, aligning Cities Alliance support to maximise the mobilisation of domestic and international financial resources. Through its Secretariat, implementing members, and partners, the Cities Alliance is responsible and accountable for delivering these outcomes. It is the partnership’s Terms of Reference.

Tier IV. Cities Alliance Organisational and Operational Preference. This tier covers the overall performance of the Cities Alliance Secretariat through its two operating windows (global window and country window) and across four different areas: partnership, volume, efficiency, and sustainability. The Secretariat is responsible and accountable for delivering these outputs. It is the Secretariat's Terms of Reference.
II. Summary

TIER I. DEVELOPMENTAL CONTEXT (MACRO LEVEL INDICATORS)
Selected SDGs

TIER II. CLIENT LEVEL RESULTS (CITY AND NEIGHBOURHOOD LEVEL INDICATORS)
- Result Area 1: Municipal Government
- Result Area 2: Services
- Result Area 3: Citizenship
- Result Area 4: Local Economy

TIER III. PROGRAMME RESULTS (PROGRAMME LEVEL INDICATORS)
- Result Area 1: Urban policies
- Result Area 2: Local strategies and plans
- Result Area 3: Infrastructure and investment
- Result Area 4: Capacity development
- Result Area 5: Civil society and communities

TIER IV. SECRETARIAT RESULTS (KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS)
- Performance Area 1: Partnership
- Performance Area 2: Volume
- Performance Area 3: Efficiency
- Performance Area 4: Sustainability

LEGEND:
- **CHALLENGE.** Majority of indicators show decrease from baseline, have failed in achieving the established target or are significantly far under the established performance standards.
- **WATCH.** Majority of indicators show no significant increase or decrease from baseline, have not yet achieved the established targets, or are under the established performance standards although within tolerance.
- **ON TRACK.** Majority of indicators show significant increase from baseline, have achieved the established targets, or meet/exceed the established performance standards.
- **SUSTAINABLE.** Targets/performance standards are consistently achieved, and mechanisms/processes underlying change are institutionalised and/or maintained without external assistance.
- **NOT APPLICABLE.** Insufficient data to establish a trend, or no target or performance standard is set.

For Tiers I, colour-coded traffic lights and targets are not provided since they pertain to the macro developmental context.
### TIER I - SDG URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>BASELINE [2017]</th>
<th>CURRENT [2019]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1 Improved quality of life, socioeconomic condition and inclusion of the urban poor.</td>
<td>I.1.1 Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing (SDG indicator 11.1.1)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>36.85%*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.1.2 Proportion of population below the poverty line (SDG indicator 1.1.1)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.1%†</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.1.3 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land (SDG indicator 1.4.2)</td>
<td>Per 1,000</td>
<td>N/A‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.1.4 Proportion of seats held by women in (a) national parliaments and (b) local governments (SDG indicator 5.5.1)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIER II - CLIENT LEVEL RESULTS (CITY AND NEIGHBOURHOOD LEVEL INDICATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1 Cities increasingly characterised by effective local government, active citizenship, and delivering improved and responsive services to the urban poor.</td>
<td>II.1.1 [Municipal Government] Average municipal expenditures per person per year</td>
<td>US$</td>
<td>21.26**</td>
<td>N/A&quot;</td>
<td>22.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW SINCE 2019 II.1.2 [Municipal Government] Total municipal revenue per year</td>
<td>US$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.1.3 [Municipal Government] Average number of municipal employees as a percentage of the total population</td>
<td>% per 1000 inhabitants</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.1.4 [Municipal Government] Average number of women among municipal employees</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Averages have a high standard deviation because of the significant contextual differences between Liberia and Tunisia. Based on most recent available data, i.e. 2014.
† Averages have a high standard deviation because of the significant contextual differences between Liberia and Tunisia. SDG official data not available.
‡ No data available in the SDG database.
§ Currently being collected – the scorecard will be updated once data becomes available. Data collection followed programmes’ logic and cycle. With regard to Liberia, data collection is linked to the mid-term evaluation of the programme. In Tunisia, data collection is waiting for the agreed design and commencement of Phase II.
** Averages have a high standard deviation because of the significant contextual differences between Liberia and Tunisia. Individual country data can be provided upon request.

** Used instead ILO data.
TIER II - CLIENT LEVEL RESULTS (CITY AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
LEVEL INDICATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5</td>
<td>[Municipal Government] Proportion of municipal employees with post-secondary education</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6</td>
<td>[Services] Proportion of population in slum and/or low-income areas with regular access to safely managed drinking water services (SDG 6.1.1)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.7</td>
<td>[Services] Proportion of population in slum and/or low-income areas using safely managed sanitation services</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.8</td>
<td>[Services] Proportion of population in slum and/or low-income areas with regular electricity connections</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.9</td>
<td>[Services] Proportion of population in slum and/or low-income areas with regular access to solid waste collection</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.10</td>
<td>[Citizenship] Average percentage of voter participation in most recent local elections</td>
<td>% of all eligible voters</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.11</td>
<td>[Citizenship] Average ratings on participatory planning process in place (budgetary or other) (SDG 16.7.2)</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW SINCE 2019 II.1.12 [Local Economy] Average rating of the informal economy working environment</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier II: Background and methodology

The second cluster of Country Programmes started in the first half of 2016 and is currently being implemented in Liberia and Tunisia. Baseline studies were carried out in 2017 for both Country Programmes. Mid-line and end-line studies are scheduled to take place as the programmes progress (ongoing, to be completed by mid-2019) and are completed (end of 2021).

The baseline study for Liberia was commissioned to the Agency for Economic Development and Empowerment (AEDE). For Tunisia, Best Consulting carried out the study. The data reported from these studies serves not only M&E purposes, but it is also used for context diagnostics and analysis, programme design, and partner and beneficiary learning. The baseline study for Liberia covered the functionally-linked cities of Monrovia and Paynesville, where the programme activities are currently focused. Data from the baseline study for Tunisia was collected within the scope of the Country Programme’s nine cities of intervention (Béja, Gabès, Jendouba, Kairouan, Médenine, M’saken, Sidi Bouzid, La Soukra and Tataouine). In addition to collecting data related to Cities Alliance corporate indicators, both studies also collected data in other areas specific to the context and programme design.

This Tier describes the impact that Cities Alliance’s technical assistance services aim to have on cities, specifically on more effective governance (indicators II.1.1 to II.1.5), inclusiveness and participation (indicators II.1.10 to II.1.11), and ability to deliver improved, responsive services to the urban poor (indicators II.1.6 to II.1.9). These indicators are mostly quantitative and based on primary data. In principle, results within this Tier could be directly linked to the Cities Alliance’s financing of physical interventions - typically managed through community development/upgrading funds - which directly affect livelihood and access to services for low-income households. Other results assume that the Cities Alliance’s technical assistance services are able to leverage and translate into effective follow-up investments and/or additional fiscal transfers, which would ultimately improve access to services but also allow cities to better cater to their citizens, especially the most marginalised.

Tier II: Baseline highlights

LIBERIA

Effective local governance (Indicators II.1.1 to II.1.5):

Effective local governance in Greater Monrovia suffers extreme legislative, budgetary and human resource constraints. Local governments are currently appointed centrally and have very limited authority. Local governments spend approximately US $3.15 per inhabitant per year, there is only one municipal worker for every 2,500 inhabitants, and only 19.4 per cent of municipal employees have post-secondary education. These low numbers indicate the enormous challenge faced by the local governments in providing services to their citizens. These resource and governance challenges are a common recurrence in the Country Programmes, and similar situations were observed in the first cluster. For instance, according to the programme baseline (2013) in Burkina Faso, the average municipal expenditure per inhabitant per year was approximately US $7.5, the ratio of municipal employees to municipal population was approximately 1 employee for every 1,786 inhabitants, and only nine per cent of municipal employees had post-secondary education.

‡ It is increasingly clear that the Cities Alliance will be challenged to expand the scope of its activities to a different city/cities, in a different county, in order to satisfy the minimum requirements of a Country Programme.
The activities that led to significant impact in governance in previous Country Programmes are being replicated in Liberia. Technical assistance is provided to support capacity development of local governments with specific trainings around waste management, governance and municipal finance. Improvements are also sought in the legislative framework with the establishment of an Association of Mayors and Local Government Authorities (AMLOGAL) in collaboration with UCLG-A and the development of a national urban policy. At the same time, it is important to remind that Liberia is currently rated as amongst the ten least developed countries in the world, and still has to deal with the consequences of protracted civil wars, and the Ebola crisis. Notwithstanding these challenges, during the period of review it also managed a very peaceful transition of power, and the Country Programme team has excellent working relationships with its Liberian partners.

**Ability to deliver improved, responsive services to the urban poor (indicators II.1.6 to II.1.9):**

The baseline study points to a major deficit in basic service delivery to the urban poor in Greater Monrovia, with 84.4 per cent access to potable water, 72.1 per cent access to sanitation, 48.6 per cent access to electricity, and 35.9 per cent access to regular waste collection. Similar deficits were witnessed within other Country Programmes. At the start of the Burkina Faso Country Programme, for example, access to potable water was 59 per cent, access to sanitation was 73 per cent, and access to regular electricity connection was 27 per cent in the informal settlement and low-income areas targeted by the programme.

To redress some of these deficits, the Country Programme in Liberia is supporting direct interventions to improve access to housing and basic services for the urban poor. An affordable housing programme is being developed in partnership with HFHI, waste management and energy projects with physical components are being designed with the European Union, and a Community Upgrading Fund (CUF) has been established to implement more than 70 community infrastructure projects. It is noteworthy that by the time of completion, the first cluster of Country Programmes (Ghana, Uganda and Vietnam) had witnessed a 20 per cent aggregate improvement across these indicators.

**Inclusiveness and participation (Indicators II.1.10 to II.1.11):**

The perception of inclusion and citizen participation is significantly low in Liberia. Although a good number of Liberians participated in the last local elections (75.2 per cent), there are few mechanisms in place for ongoing and effective citizen engagement with local authorities and participatory planning. Civil society is very active, but there is a disconnect between their activities and city management. The Country Programme is tackling the issue of inclusion and mobilisation from several angles, including: mapping and organising urban poor communities; strengthening the informal sector so residents can advocate for their legal space in the city; supporting local governments with participatory planning processes; and promoting national and municipal urban forums as platforms where all urban development stakeholders at the national, city and community levels can interact and seek inclusive solutions.

**TUNISIA**

**Effective local governance (Indicators II.1.1 to II.1.5):**

Baseline data on effective local governance and participation highlight major focus areas for Country Programme interventions. Average municipal expenditure per person per year is lower than with the first cluster of Country Programmes at their initiation (US $39.36). Women account for only 14.56 per cent of the average municipal workforce, and only 6.87 per cent of municipal employees are educated beyond secondary school level.
The Country Programme will make advancements in these areas by improving the enabling environment through funded activities at the national level. It is supporting the development of an integrated, comprehensive urban policy framework that will be able to create an institutional platform for effective management of urban development. It is also supporting the Tunisian government’s decentralization efforts to increase fiscal transfer to local authorities and the inter-municipal cooperation agenda to encourage more effective pooling of financial and human resources and interventions across legislative boundaries. Finally, both Phase I and II of the programme will have several development opportunities for local governments.

Ability to deliver improved, responsive services to the urban poor (indicators II.1.6 to II.1.9):

The levels of service delivery to the urban poor are quite high (above 90 per cent access to potable water, electricity and sewerage connections), although there is still room for meaningful intervention. The Tunisia Country Programme is financing small-scale projects in eight participating cities which are expected to have some direct impact. In the medium term, Phase II of the programme will support local governments to turn the cities’ CDS priorities into investment-ready projects and improve their access to different infrastructure financing options (private sector, public sector, and international financial institutions).

Inclusiveness and participation (Indicators II.1.10 to II.1.11):

There is still substantial room for improvement in participation and inclusion, which was one of the main drivers behind the Arab Spring. While indicator on participatory planning processes scores quite high (2 on a rating scale of 0 to 2) because of targeted efforts by the government and international partners, ratings are low in other aspects of citizenship, such as voting. The programme is already institutionalising participatory planning in eight cities, and it will seek to consolidate this approach into a more comprehensive framework for citizen participation around priority infrastructure projects.

**TIER III - PROGRAMME RESULTS (PROGRAMME LEVEL INDICATORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.1 National policy frameworks developed and/or enhanced to address urban development needs</td>
<td>III.1.1 Number of urban policies at the national level developed and/or updated</td>
<td>Unit (aggregate from scale: values = or &gt; 2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100% (2)</td>
<td>33% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.1.2 Number of urban dialogues which delivered strategic, policy and/or normative influence</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TIER III - PROGRAMME RESULTS (PROGRAMME LEVEL INDICATORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.2 Local strategies and plans developed towards effective urban development</td>
<td>III.2.1 Number of local strategies/plans developed</td>
<td>Unit (aggregate from scale: values = or &gt; 2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7% (1)</td>
<td>64% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.3 Infrastructure and leveraging of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.3.1 Number of beneficiaries of infrastructure projects</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600,000*</td>
<td>93,980</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.3.2 Amount of funds leveraged for investments in cities</td>
<td>US$ total value (,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60mn*</td>
<td>~3.45mn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.4 Capacities strengthened in city governance and management areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.4.1 Number of urban institutions (Cities Alliance members, local governments, national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) with strengthened capacities</td>
<td>Unit (aggregate from scale: values = or &gt; 2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% (23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.4.2 Number of people (professionals in the national and local governments, community representatives, civil society, etc.) with strengthened capacities</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000*</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.4.3 Number of toolkits and other TA products with evidence of uptake by the stakeholders and/or beneficiaries</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIER III - PROGRAMME RESULTS (PROGRAMME LEVEL INDICATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.5</td>
<td>III.5.1 Number of regularly-functioning mechanisms developed to engage communities and civil society in urban governance</td>
<td>Unit (aggregate from scale: values = or &gt; 2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Country Targets are set in consideration of Tunisia and Liberia only. As other countries are added to the portfolio, the overall targets will be revised and increased.
Tier III: Background and methodology

Tier III indicators measure progress in the achievement of intermediate outcomes, mainly on maturity scales showing the level of maturity for each outcome indicator, from programme initiation to programme completion. The indicators are measured across the universe of cities and countries of intervention as well as the programmatic portfolio. Overall, indicators in this Tier are on track and in line to deliver on their targets.

Tier III: Evidence

III.1.1 Number of urban policies at the national level developed and/or updated

In the second cluster of Country Programmes (Liberia and Tunisia), the development of national urban policies is maintained as a key component of the intervention design. Both programmes recognise the need for a favourable policy environment as an enabling factor for effective management of urban development.

LIBERIA

The feasibility phase for the Liberia national urban policy has been successfully completed. The diagnosis phase, which is ongoing, seeks to deepen and provide insight into the findings of the feasibility studies conducted, and it also aims to expand and strengthen stakeholder engagement at all levels with active citizen involvement in the policy development process. Several milestones have been reached in this phase, including two regional diagnostic notes, preparation of a national diagnostic report, and a series of stakeholder workshops for validation and capacity building. On a general note, the Ministry of Internal Affairs – the national partner and driver of the NUP – is highly engaged in the development of the policy, which it considers to be a crucial instrument for its agenda due to the far-reaching potential impact. Engagements with most local government authorities and other local stakeholders showed a similar eagerness for participation and ownership of the policy.

The Country Programme also worked with the Liberian government to finalise the Slum Upgrading and Affordable Housing Framework. The framework identifies upgrading as a viable housing policy option and explores issues such as decongestion and densification, and how to upgrade slums in a way that does not negatively impact the livelihood of slum dwellers. The framework has been adopted by the National Housing Authority, which in 2017 set up a Slum Upgrading Unit to guide work in slums, provide housing solutions to low-income families, and take the needs of the urban poor into consideration in national planning. The Unit was established with guidance and advice provided by the Country Programme through HFHI. The framework marks a shift in the government’s approach to slum upgrading; previous attempts at relocation failed because the slum dwellers, unable to earn a living, unsurprisingly returned to their previous settlements. The framework addresses this issue by focusing on livelihoods in addition to housing and infrastructure needs. Once again, these initiatives demonstrate the importance of the Cities Alliance’s focus on the provision of land, services and citizenship as the cornerstone to citywide upgrading programmes.

TUNISIA

In 2018, Cities Alliance finalised an agreement with UN-Habitat to develop a coherent, operational National Urban Policy (NUP) for an inclusive joint vision of the future development of Tunisian cities over the next two years as a component of the Country Programmes. In Q2 of 2019, a feasibility phase will build interest and political support around a strategic vision of urban development in Tunisian cities.
through a nationwide consultation process. During the diagnostic phase in Q3, the state of urbanisation, challenges, and opportunities will be investigated. The formulation phase will take place in 2020, when an action and implementation plan will be developed.

Beyond the national urban policy, there are other notable improvements in the national legislative framework around cities. The CDS process has contributed to advancing the application of Tunisia’s 2018 Local Government Code, in particular Article 101 on local development plans. The CDS experience will also inform the integration of participative local planning into the Tunisian Ministry of Development, Investment and International Cooperation’s 2021–2025 Five-Year Development Plan.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Cities Alliance supported the development process for a new National Housing and Habitat Policy in Paraguay together with Chile, GIZ, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and Habitat for Humanity International. The policy introduced participatory culture and the concept of integrated slum upgrading in Paraguay and is a major innovation in how it approaches housing. Cities Alliance worked with local organisations to design the policy, which has provided a strong foundation and support for the policy’s trends and direction. The design process has influenced local partners to begin engaging with South Korea to establish an institute of urban research.

III.1.2 Number of urban dialogues which delivered strategic, policy and/or normative influence

The JWP for Equitable Economic Growth in Cities organised its main annual policy dialogue at the 8th Africities Summit in Marrakesh with a session dedicated to identifying strategies for local governments to improve management of public land and space to support increased productivity in cities. It was the JWP’s most substantially ambitious event to date, as it was backed by comprehensive JWP toolkits and resources on the role of public space for informal workers and public land management in Uganda. As a result of the dialogue, key messages from the session were included in the summit’s final political statement. Two additional global dialogues were organised at the 9th session of the World Urban Forum in Kuala Lumpur: one on the significance of public space for urban livelihoods, and a second on equitable growth paths in secondary cities in Bangladesh. Both delivered increased visibility of (and attention to) the role of public goods and services as pathways to more equitable growth.

At the national level, the JWP partnered with UNCDF, the city of Jinja and the Urban Authorities Association of Uganda (UAAU) to organise the first-ever Uganda Urban Expo focused on boosting investments in the country’s secondary cities. The event brought unprecedented national and international attention to the issue of secondary cities. Eight city-level dialogues (two per country) were organised as part of the JWP Campaign Cities initiative in Bangladesh, Ghana, Kenya, and Uganda. The dialogues formed a crucial step in the process to formulate policy recommendations and action plans, and they were all attended by 50+ participants – constituting multi-stakeholder forums. Evaluation forms submitted by city focal points for each of the outputs delivered to date indicate that the average level of overall satisfaction is 4.5 on a scale from 1 to 5. The focal points rate the engagement process (of which the dialogues are a key part) particularly high, with 75 per cent stating that the engagement process was very satisfactory.

In the context of the JWP on Resilience, Cities Alliance coorganised and helped build the partnership for the Cities and Climate Change Science Conference (CitiesIPCC), which brought together scientists, policy makers, and urban

---

55 Africities is the pre-eminent gathering of African mayors, cities and their partners. It is held every three years.
practitioners for the first time to discuss the impact of climate change, how cities are contributing to the problem and the solution, and new research areas on the science of cities and climate change.

Cities Alliance coalesced around the importance of informality and informal settlements in research and action moving forward and pushed the conversation more towards secondary cities and their access to knowledge and information about climate change. These messages were clearly visible throughout the conference, the plenary session, and in the conference’s main outcome: the Research and Action Agenda on Cities and Climate Change, for which Cities Alliance was a co-author. The Action Agenda was subsequently presented to the 48th plenary of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) as part of its progress report, which was noted by the Panel - a successful effort to raise the visibility of urban within the IPCC. CitiesIPCC has been recognised as an important step in establishing a relationship between urban practitioners and the scientific community in the area of climate change, and there has been a strong uptake from individual researchers on social media, papers and journal articles.

III.2.1 Number of local strategies/plans developed

LIBERIA

The development of a Greater Monrovia City Development strategy is ongoing, and experienced some post-election delays in the appointment of local government officials. In 2018, thematic groups and citywide forums were established to discuss the issues that will be at the centre of the CDS. Three strategic thrusts have been prioritised: water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); land tenure; and low revenue generation by local authorities.

TUNISIA

Cities Alliance has supported the elaboration of city development strategies in nine mostly inland cities (the Madinatouna CDS initiative). These city development strategies were all undertaken by UNDP as part of the Country Programme. Although the strategies and their subsequent Action Plans were finalised in 2018, Cities Alliance will continue to support the partnering cities with institutionalisation and implementation in 2019. Phase II of the Country Programme will support four of the nine municipalities in preparing investment plans that help prioritise, design, and prepare exemplary projects for implementation. The Madinatouna CDS initiative has been so successful that the Tunisian government has decided to expand it to all 365 municipalities in the country. Cities Alliance has been asked to provide advisory support to this process and assist with the establishment of a national task force, which will oversee and coordinate the rollout. To support the CDS process nationwide, the Tunisian government is developing a guide for local development plans with investment plans and a capital budget based on the Madinatouna approach.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Within the JWP EEG, two actions plans were developed as part of its Campaign Cities initiative in Bangladesh: an Action Plan on Medical Waste Management and Vocational Training Centre in Sylhet, and an Action Plan for Women’s Complex and City Digital Centres in Narayanganj. In Sylhet, the evidence base and action plan produced received especially strong buy-in and resulted in a commitment by the local government to support and co-finance further work related to waste management.
III.3.1 Number of beneficiaries of infrastructure projects

**LIBERIA**

Through the Community Upgrading Fund, Cities Alliance identified ten community projects and piloted three: the construction of a kindergarten classroom block in West Point, and six water points (three in Popo Beach and three in King Peter communities). According to the profiling information from Cities Alliance partner Slum Dwellers International, West Point has an estimated population of 85,000; Popo Beach 4,980; and King Peter 4,000, meaning the first three community CUF projects directly benefit an estimated 93,980 residents.

**TUNISIA**

As a follow-up to the city development strategies, Cities Alliance will finance an estimated 16 small-scale infrastructure projects within eight participating cities, via the association of Tunisian local authorities (FNVT). The municipalities will propose the projects to FNVT and the Cities Alliance. The nature of the projects is still being defined, but they will range from interventions around basic services to green public spaces.

III.3.2 Amount of funds leveraged for investments in cities

**TUNISIA**

In 2018, funds were mobilised for the second phase of the Country Programme, which focuses on implementing the city development strategies in the nine cities starting in 2019. The Country Programme will support cities in turning prioritised investments into bankable projects, align them with other relevant public and/or private investments, and identify viable financing options. To this end, municipal staff of at least four partner cities will receive training on investment planning and management, and a Public Private Dialogue (PPD) on investment will be established.

At the end of 2018, UNDP launched its ‘Goal 16 Integrated Programme’, which has committed US $3 million in follow-up funding for the Madinatouna project to promote strategic city planning and CDS implementation in three of the Country Programme’s nine partner cities (Gabès, Medenine, and Tataouine). Municipal development projects identified within the CDSs are also being funded through other UNDP programmes, such as its youth and civil society support programme and the programme against violent extremism. Other implementing partners have equally transitioned to the implementation phase. MedCities is financing a CDS-prioritised project on the recovery of rainwater and recycling of grey water in Gabès in collaboration with the USAID-supported Tunisia Accountability, Decentralization, and Effective Municipalities (TADAEEEM) Programme. In addition, CILG VNGi has initiated the implementation of the CDS action plans in the cities of Beja, Medenine, and Sidi Bouzid.

**LIBERIA**

As part of its role within the Country Programme, Habitat for Humanity International has received a $420,000 grant from the OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID) to implement community infrastructure projects in Peace Island (water points and toilet facilities). In addition, WaterAid Liberia committed $20,000 towards the transfer of eco-friendly technologies from Ghana to Liberia.
III.4.1 Number of urban institutions (Cities Alliance members, local governments, national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) with strengthened capacities

AND

III.4.2 Number of people (professionals in the national and local governments, community representatives, civil society, etc.) with strengthened capacities

LIBERIA

Through its implementing partners, Cities Alliance has built the capacity of both local and national government officials. With the SDI grant, 811 slum dwellers (309 males and 502 females) have been capacitated to profile, map and enumerate informal settlements. In addition, 52 street vendor leaders (26 males and 26 females) were capacitated to promote safe labour conditions in partnership with local government, and 29 national housing staff were capacitated in HFHI’s Participatory Approach to Safe Shelter and Settlements Awareness.

TUNISIA

The CDS process undertaken through the Madinatouna project has reinforced the capacities of the nine partnering municipalities to assume their new responsibilities as stipulated in the Local Government Code, with particular attention to strategic urban planning and management, as well as participatory governance (e.g. tools for citizen consultation). A variety of workshops and trainings have equipped local officials with an understanding of strategic planning tools to develop a city vision, objectives, means for including citizens into decision-making, and monitoring progress. The design of an action plan has allowed local management teams to turn their vision into tangible objectives and subsequent projects. This exercise was repeated with the municipality of La Soukra, which joined the exercise with its own means. Moreover, a training of trainers has begun in an attempt to institutionalise the built knowledge on strategic urban planning through a network of cities for experience exchange and replication in other municipalities.

In total, over 40 municipal staff members in the partnering municipalities were trained, of whom 15 were women. 84 per cent of the trained officials stated that they increased their competencies and capacities thanks to the training. In addition, 65 municipal actors participated in inter-city meetings to exchange best practices around citizen consultation and the alignment of the CDS with the SDGs (with 43 per cent women and 37 per cent youth participating).

III.4.3 Number of toolkits and other TA products with evidence of uptake by the stakeholders and/or beneficiaries

Several toolkits and knowledge products of the JWP EEG received strong uptake, particularly those on the relationship between public space, informal workers, and economic development in cities. The work with WIEGO to produce a suite of resources to support regulated access to public space for the informally working poor was disseminated through events targeted at each of the three main audiences: local governments (at a session at the Africities Summit), association of informal workers (at WIEGO’s annual assembly) and development workers and practitioners (at a seminar broadcast online at the City University of New York). Several recommendations from the studies were reflected in the final political statement endorsed by the delegates to the Africities Summit. In Uganda, the success of the report on public land and space spurred the development of an additional knowledge product adapted to a global audience.
At the regional level, it is worth to mention the launch of the first edition of the CEE ratings for Asia (Assessing the Institutional Environment of Local Governments) and the third edition of the same publication for Africa. In Africa, across the recent years, the publication has become a well-respected reference amongst practitioners and governments alike.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, the Cities Alliance played a fundamental role in establishing and launching the UHPH, an open platform for organisations committed to improving housing conditions for the urban poor in LAC. It combines a digital space with in-person interactions where people can connect and access information about housing in the region, linking policy and planning efforts with practitioners on the ground. The UHPH is serving as the housing pillar for a new urban platform that is being established by the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL). The platform brings together different components to create space for collecting knowledge experiences. Cities Alliance’s publication ‘An overview of national urban laws in Latin America and the Caribbean: case studies from Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador’, which looks at the main elements that need to be considered when constructing a national legal framework from the standpoint of urban reform, addresses an issue that has received little coverage. CEPAL is using the methodology outlined in the publication as a basis for its new knowledge-sharing forum.

III.5.1 Number of regularly functioning mechanisms developed to engage communities and civil society in urban governance

**LIBERIA:**

In Liberia, the establishment of the CUF steering committee provides an institutional and regulated platform where citizens and communities can engage with the municipality and the ministry to decide upon the allocation of funding for small-scale infrastructure projects. The committee meets on a quarterly basis to discuss the prioritisation and feasibility of the community projects. The CUF itself is expected to be transferred to a Liberian financial institution at the end of the programme.

**TUNISIA:**

In Tunisia, the adoption of the Local Government Code 2018 has enshrined citizen participation in subnational governance, and guidance on its local operationalisation and institutionalisation has been devised. The CDS process itself has served as an effective tool for mobilising citizens around municipal development, such as through public consultations on the city’s vision and development priorities; in total around 10,000 citizens have been consulted through municipal committees, workshops, and citizen satisfaction surveys. The municipal committees are envisioned to remain in place beyond project closure and have the potential to be a long-term instrument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>PREVIOUS RF</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>World Bank (Up to 30 August 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.1.1 Multi-member new programmes/initiatives per year</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.1.2 Total co-financing per programme per year</td>
<td>US$ total value, thousands</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>3,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.1.3 Members’ impression of Secretariat effectiveness</td>
<td>Scale AVG score</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.2.1 Number of TA activities approved</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.2.2 Total value of TA activities approved</td>
<td>US$ total value, thousands</td>
<td>8,081</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>2,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.2.3 Knowledge products that are financed by the Cities Alliance and produced by members, partners and/or the Secretariat</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.2.4 Policy dialogues that are financed by Cities Alliance and implemented by members, partners and/or the Secretariat</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.3.1 Grant Making: Average time from initial submission of proposal to approval of grant</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV.3.2 Grant Making: Average time from approval of grant to grant agreement</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tier IV: Secretariat Results (Key Performance Indicators)

#### Result Previous RF Indicators Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UNOPS (From 1 Jan - 31 Dec 2014)</th>
<th>2015 (From 1 Jan - 31 Dec 2015)</th>
<th>2016 (From 1 Jan - 31 Dec 2016)</th>
<th>2017 (From 1 Jan - 31 Dec 2017)</th>
<th>2018 (From 1 Jan - 31 Dec 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>6,487</td>
<td>7,484</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>7,132</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Yearly Performance Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018 % Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>929%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>143%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TIER IV. SECRETARIAT RESULTS (KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>PREVIOUS RF</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>World Bank (Up to 30 August 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.3 Efficiency</td>
<td>IV.4.3</td>
<td>IV.3.3 Grant Making Efficiency: Average time from grant agreement to first disbursement</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.4.4</td>
<td>IV.3.4 Grant Making Efficiency: Average time from grant expiration to closing</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.2.3</td>
<td>IV.3.5 TA activities effectively supervised</td>
<td>% of total reports received</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.3.3</td>
<td>IV.3.6 Audience access to knowledge products</td>
<td>Unique Visitor Access</td>
<td>36,656</td>
<td>69,830</td>
<td>78,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.4 Sustainability</td>
<td>IV.4.8</td>
<td>IV.4.1 Secretariat staff capacity on Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>% positive feedback ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.4.7</td>
<td>IV.4.2 Secretariat Greenhouse Gas Emissions performance (tonnes CO2 equivalent)</td>
<td>Average emissions per staff</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>IV.4.3</td>
<td>Secretariat Delivery Performance</td>
<td>% completed activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>IV.4.4</td>
<td>Cities Alliance revenue growth rate</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** No historical data available – target subject to revision.
## TIER IV.

### SECRETARIAT RESULTS (KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARLY PERFORMANCE STANDARD</th>
<th>2018 % COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS (From 31 Aug - 31 Dec 2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.4.1 Secretariat staff capacity on Gender Mainstreaming</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% positive feedback ratings</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.4.2 Secretariat Greenhouse Gas Emissions performance (tonnes CO2 equivalent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average emissions per staff</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.4.3 Secretariat Delivery Performance % completed activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.4.4 Cities Alliance revenue growth rate %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.3.3 Grant Making Efficiency
- **Average time from grant agreement to first disbursement (Days)**
  - 42
  - 16.8
  - 10.0
  - 12
  - 19
  - 30
  - 10
  - 33%
- **Average time from grant expiration to closing (Days)**
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - 317
  - 120***
  - 38%

### IV.3.4 Grant Making Efficiency
- **Average time from grant expiration to closing (Days)**
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - 90
  - 90
  - 91
  - 90
  - 101%

### IV.3.5 TA activities effectively supervised
- % of total reports received
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - 75
  - N/A
  - 90
  - 90
  - 90
  - 91
  - 90
  - 101%

### IV.3.6 Audience access to knowledge products
- Unique Visitor Access
  - 23,874
  - 53,392
  - 76,520
  - 76,530
  - 73,821
  - 73,637
  - 70,000
  - 105%

### IV.2.3 TA activities effectively supervised
- % of total reports received
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - 75
  - N/A
  - 90
  - 90
  - 90
  - 91
  - 90
  - 101%

### IV.4.3 Secretariat Delivery Performance % completed activities
- % positive feedback ratings
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - 57%
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - 75%

### IV.4.4 Cities Alliance revenue growth rate %
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- 13.4
- 12.3
- 8
- 5
- 5
- 5
- 100%
- 64%
- 136%
Tier IV. Highlights

- Performance on partnerships remained high, with the launch of new major programmes for a total financial value of $6.5m (the JWP on Migration and the Innovation Programme special call).

- The normative work of the organisation maintains an excellent delivery rate with the production and delivery of important knowledge products and policy dialogues. As Tier III has shown, some of these activities have also had important uptake and policy influence.

- It is highly positive also the inversion of the decreasing trend in income. In 2018, income rose by 20% and coincided with the first year of implementation of the new Strategic Plan and significant business and governance improvements.

- Technical Assistance. Volume and financial indicators have shown a recovery from the previous 2017 low point but still felt short of the targets set by the work plan and year budget. This is primarily due to three factors: (i) the delayed start of the Migration JWP which agreement was signed only later in the year; (ii) the transition to the country programme 3.0 model which, in Liberia, called for intensive project re-design now expected to pay dividends in 2019, and, in the case of Tunisia, required a longer design and negotiation for the setup of its second phase; (iii) an unexpected, but significant turnover in the staff complement and, (iv) the internal restructuring of the Secretariat. While this has allowed for a more effective and rationalized organizational and management structure of the Secretariat, it nonetheless had a one-off impact on the delivery rate in the more immediate term.

- To be noted also the less positive data on the grant efficiency process. This is an inversion in the overall positive trend of the last years which brought the organisation very close to the challenging 100 days’ target. This is due primarily not to systems and processes, which have significantly improved, but rather to the above-mentioned loss of staff capacity, which has now been addressed.

- It is worth mentioning the excellent rate of the Secretariat’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions because of the persistent and conscious effort to rationalise staff travels and the sponsoring of event participants.
Annex 1. Indicator definition
TIER I: DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT
I.1. Improved quality of life, socio-economic condition and inclusion of the urban poor

I.1.1 Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing (SDG indicator 11.1.1): The urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing (numerator) divided by the total urban population (denominator), expressed as a percentage.

Sources: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/

I.1.2 Urban poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) (equivalent to SDG indicator 1.1.1): Urban poverty gap at national poverty lines is the urban population’s mean shortfall from the poverty lines (counting the nonpoor as having zero shortfall) as a percentage of the poverty lines. This measure reflects the depth of poverty as well as its incidence.

Sources: https://data.worldbank.org

I.1.3 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure to land (SDG indicator 1.4.2): Indicator is composed of two parts: (A) measures the incidence of adults with legally recognized documentation over land among the total adult population; while (B) focuses on the incidence of adults who report having perceived secure rights to land among the adult population.

Sources: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/

I.1.4 Proportion of seats held by women in local governments (SDG indicator 5.5.1): Indicator measures the proportion of positions held by women in local government. It is expressed as a percentage of elected positions held by women in legislative/deliberative bodies of local government.

Sources: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/

TIER II: CLIENT RESULTS
II.1. Cities increasingly characterised by effective local government, active citizenship, and delivering improved and responsive services to the urban poor.

II.1.1 Average municipal expenditure per person per year [Municipal Government]. Total operating expenditures of municipality in a given year. Average expressed in US$.

Sources: Finance department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.2 Total municipal revenue per year [Municipal Government]. Total annual revenue generated by the local government from sources other than direct central government transfers. Figure expressed in USD.

Sources: Finance department of municipality.

II.1.3 Average number of municipal employees as a percentage of the total population [Municipal Government]. Numerator: Total number of employees directly or indirectly employed by the municipality in a given year. Denominator: Total population of municipality in same year. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Human Resources department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.4 Average number of women among municipal employees [Municipal Government]. Numerator: Total number of women directly or indirectly employed by the municipality in a given year. Denominator: Total number of municipal employees in same year. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Human Resources department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.5 Proportion of municipal employees with post-secondary education [Municipal Government]. Numerator: Number of well-trained employees (engineers, technical experts, etc.) in a municipality in a given year. Denominator: Total number of municipal employees in the same year. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Human Resources department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.6 Proportion of population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas with access to safely managed drinking water services (equivalent to SDG indicator 6.1.1) [Services]. Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services is currently being measured by the proportion of population using an improved basic drinking water source which is located on premises, available when needed and free of faecal (and priority chemical) contamination. ‘Improved’ drinking water sources include: piped water into dwelling, yard or plot; public taps or standpipes; boreholes or tubewells; protected dug wells; protected springs; packaged water; delivered water and rainwater. Numerator: Population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas with access to
safely managed drinking water services. Denominator: Total population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal water/sanitation departments; surveys.

II.1.7 Proportion of population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas using safely managed sanitation services (equivalent to SDG indicator 6.2.1) [Services]. ‘Safe’ sanitation facilities include: flush or pour flush toilets to sewer systems, septic tanks or pit latrines, ventilated improved pit latrines, pit latrines with a slab, and composting toilets. Numerator: Population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas with access to safely managed sanitation services. Denominator: Total population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal water/sanitation departments; surveys.

II.1.8 Proportion of population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas with regular electricity connections (equivalent to SDG indicator 7.1.1) [Services]. Access to electricity refers mainly to connection to the grid, but it also includes other reliable off-grid electricity sources such as solar energy. Numerator: Population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas with connection to electricity. Denominator: Total population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal/local electricity supply agency; surveys.

II.1.9 Proportion of population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas with access to regular solid waste collection (either publicly or privately) (equivalent to SDG indicator 11.6.1) [Services]. Regularly Collected Municipal Solid Waste refers to municipal solid waste that is routinely collected from specific addresses or designated collection points. Waste collection is conducted directly by municipal authorities or private contractors licensed/commissioned by municipal authorities with a regular schedule of the day of the week and time of collection. In some cases, private waste collection companies have contracts with clients individually and provide collection services. Numerator: Population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas that are served by regular solid waste collection (either publicly or privately). Denominator: Total population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal sanitation departments; surveys.

II.1.10 Average percentage of voter participation in most recent local elections [Citizenship]. Numerator: Number of eligible voters who voted in most recent local elections. Denominator: Number of eligible (or registered) voters in municipality for the same election. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: GCIF; election registers.

II.1.11 Average rating of participatory planning processes in place (budgetary or other) [Citizenship]. Participatory planning is a tool for identifying the collective needs of all individuals within a community, a way of building consensus, and a means of empowering disadvantaged or disenfranchised groups (World Bank). Rating scale:

0 Little or no participatory planning
1 Participatory planning processes are in place but are ad hoc and irregular
2 Participatory planning processes are in place, formalised and used regularly.

Sources: Surveys and interviews.

II.1.12 Average rating of the informal economy working environment [Local Economy]. Informal economy as described by ILO. This indicator measures the extent to which the informal economy is recognised and supported the national and local government. Rating scale:

0 No support to the informal economy / hostility towards the informal economy
1 Ad hoc and unsystematic support to the informal economy
2 Systematic and regular support to the informal economy

Sources: Surveys and interviews.

TIER III: PROGRAMME RESULTS

III.1 National policy frameworks developed and/or enhanced to address urban development needs.

III.1.1 Number of urban policies at the national level developed and/or updated [Urban Policies]. The indicator counts the maturity stage and number of urban-related policies at the national level developed and/or updated through the Cities Alliance. Policies on urban development may include sectoral policies covering some or all of the following aspects: housing, slum upgrading, transport, land, fiscal decentralisation.
III.1.2 Number of urban dialogues which delivered strategic, policy and/or normative influence [Urban Policies].

The indicator counts the number of urban dialogues shaped by the Cities Alliances at global, national and local level which have had some form of influence on urban policies/thinking. Influence is captured in one or more of the following broad dimensions: increased interest/knowledge on urban issues, increased alignment and partnerships, increased visibility and prominence of urban issues, significant quantity and profiles of attendees, significant follow-up actions, shift in certain values/beliefs (e.g. on forced evictions), adoption of policy recommendations.

Sources: Secretariat records, feedback survey, interviews, fact-finding stories.

III.2 Local strategies and plans developed towards effective urban development

III.2.1 Number of local strategies/plans developed [Local Strategies/Plans]. The indicator measures the maturity stage and number of strategies/plans developed in cities in which Cities Alliance works such as city development strategies (CDSs), slum upgrading strategies, resilience plans, investment plans, etc.

Unit: Number (#) and Rating scale

0 Strategy/Plan not developed
1 Strategy/Plan development in process
2 Strategy/Plan development completed

Sources: Copies of the strategies/plans, and Secretariat records.

III.3 Infrastructure and leveraging of funds

III.3.1 Number of beneficiaries of infrastructure projects [Infrastructure and Investment].

This indicator counts the number of people who have directly benefitted from infrastructure projects implemented through Cities Alliance funding such as Community Upgrading Fund (CUF) projects.

Unit: Number (#)

Sources: Secretariat records

III.3.2 Amount of funds leveraged for investments in cities [Infrastructure and Investment]. This indicator measures the amount of co-, parallel and follow up funds committed by other partners (local and international) towards urban projects as a result of investments by the Cities Alliance.

Unit: USD

Sources: Secretariat records

III.4 Capacities strengthened in city governance and management areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management.

III.4.1 Number of urban institutions (Cities Alliance members, local governments, national government units/agencies, public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) whose capacities have been strengthened [Capacity Development].

This indicator counts the number of institutions (local governments, national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) whose capacities have been strengthened in city governance and management areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management. It also monitors the extent to which the engagement of Cities Alliance members in country-based and/or global programmes have contributed to a change in members’ corporate practices and policies.

Unit: Number (#) and Rating scale

0 Institutional capacity not strengthened
1 Institutional capacity strengthening in process
2 Institutional capacity strengthening completed

Sources: Secretariat records, programme-based member survey

III.4.2 Number of people (local and national government officials and technicians, community representatives, civil society, etc.) whose capacities have been strengthened [Capacity Development].

This indicator counts the number of people (local governments, national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) whose capacities have been strengthened in city governance and management areas such as strategic planning, financial management, human resources management, community project management etc. Unit: Number (#)

Sources: Secretariat records
III.4.3 Number of toolkits and other TA products with evidence of uptake by the stakeholders and/or beneficiaries

The indicator counts the number of toolkits or similar knowledge products on urban issues that have been developed, synthesised and/or updated by the Cities Alliance and show sign of uptake by the stakeholders/beneficiaries. Toolkits are understood as thematic guidelines and practitioners’ materials to inform technical assistance programmes. These toolkits may derive for example from a global review of case studies, national and local diagnostic work and/or a review of existing practices and guidelines, etc.

Unit: Number (#)

Sources: Copies of the toolkits and Secretariat records.

III.5 Mechanisms developed to engage citizens in city/urban governance

III.5.1 Number of participation mechanisms developed to engage citizens in city governance [Civil Society and Communities].

This indicator rates the degree of participation by citizens - with a specific focus on slum dwellers, informal workers and civil society - in city governance by counting governance mechanisms such as social accountability mechanisms, slum development committees, informal workers’ associations, municipal fora, etc.

Unit: Number (#) and Rating scale

0  Mechanism not developed
1  Development of mechanism in process
2  Development of mechanism completed

Sources: Secretariat records.

TIER IV: SECRETARIAT RESULTS

IV.1.1 Multi-member new programmes and/or initiatives per year [Partnership].
Indicator measures the number of formalised cooperation frameworks involving two or more members in a given year as a measure degree of the success of the Secretariat convening process. Forms of formalised cooperation may be: framework documents for Country Programmes; MOUs; resolution of partners; statement of agreement. Multi-member is defined as two or more Cities Alliance members.

Source: Secretariat records.

IV.1.2 Scaling: Total co-financing per programme per year [Partnership].
Indicator measures total co-funding contributed in a given year to a specific programme by partners directly and/or jointly fundraised. It also calculates the value ratio of the total funds per Secretariat funding.

Source: Secretariat records.

IV.1.3 Members’ impression of Secretariat effectiveness [Partnership]. Average rating by members in a given year. Scale of five (1 - very unsatisfactory; 5 - very satisfactory) on selected statements.

Sources: Cities Alliance Secretariat yearly survey of members

IV.2.1 TA activities (CP, JWP and Innovation Fund) approved [Volume].
Indicator measures the total number of TA activities [both grants and contracts] approved in a given year following the appraisal process.

Source: Secretariat records.

IV.2.2 Total value of TA activities (CP, JWP and Innovation Fund) approved [Volume].
Indicator measures the total cumulative US$ value funded by the Cities Alliance of TA activities [both grants and contracts] approved in a given year following the appraisal process.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.2.3 Knowledge products that are financed by the Cities Alliance and produced by members, partners and/or the Secretariat [Volume].
Indicator measures the total number and cost of knowledge products developed with Cities Alliance financing, as well as the alignment of the knowledge products and strategy, and demonstrates clear and proactive management of the delivery of Cities Alliance knowledge to targeted audiences. Knowledge products may include: thematic publications, published diagnostic studies such as the CEE ratings, State of the Cities Report (SOCR) or Urbanisation Review (UR); toolkits; and other guides, policy papers etc. produced by members and partners with Cities Alliance Secretariat support and funding. Generally, a knowledge product should have a Cities Alliance logo.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.2.4 Policy dialogues and formal learning events that are financed by Cities Alliance and implemented by members, partners and/or the Secretariat [Volume].
Indicator measures the total number of Policy Dialogues, Advocacy and Knowledge and Learning events that are financed by grants and carried out by member and partners. Policy dialogues may include: (i) formal consultation events with members and/or relevant institutions (e.g., IBSA; Policy Advisory Forum, 100RC); (ii) Advocacy/Communications events (e.g., seminars/
workshops at Africities, WUF). Formal learning exchanges could include: peer-to-peer events and study tours, learning workshops and seminars.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.3.1 Grant Making - Average time from initial submission of proposal to approval of grant [Efficiency]. Average time, in days, from initial submission of proposal to approval of grant for projects completing this phase in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.3.2 Grant Making - Average time from approval of grant to grant agreement [Efficiency]. Average time, in days, from approval of grant to signature of grant agreement for projects whose agreement was signed in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.3.3 Grant Making - Average time from grant agreement to first disbursement [Efficiency]. Average time, in days, from signature of grant agreement to first disbursement for projects receiving first disbursement in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.3.4 Grant Making - Average time from final disbursement to closing [Efficiency]. Average time, in days, from final disbursement to closing for projects closed in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.3.5 TA activities effectively supervised [Efficiency]. Indicator measures quality of supervision. Percent of grants and contracts with progress and completion reports that include information on process and results achieved in a given year. Numerator: number of grants/contracts with at least 75% of all required progress and completion reports. Denominator: Total number of TA activities supervised.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.3.6 Audience access to knowledge products [Efficiency]. Indicator measures the effective distribution of knowledge products via the Cities Alliance website (number of unique visitors to the CA website on specific knowledge pages/downloads from targeted countries). Total number of unique visitors to the CA website from targeted countries.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

IV.4.1 Secretariat staff capacity on Gender Mainstreaming [Sustainability]. Average feedback rating by staff in a given year on selected statements evaluating workshops and other capacity development activities focused on gender.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat feedback and evaluation forms

IV.4.2 Secretariat Greenhouse Gas Emissions performance [Sustainability]. Average emissions per Cities Alliance staff (tonnes CO2 equivalent) calculated on the following sources: Air travel, On-site Electricity, On-site Refrigerants, Public transport during official travel, Purchased heat/steam, CFC/HCFCS.

Source: UNOPS GHG Annual Inventory as part of Greening the Blue initiative.

IV.4.3 Secretariat Delivery Performance [Sustainability]. Indicators measures the rate of completed activities against the approved annual work plan in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat Annual Work Plan reviews.

IV.4.4 Cities Alliance revenues growth rate [Sustainability]. Revenue Growth Rate measures the year-over-year percentage increase in revenue. Revenue Nominator: Revenue current year. Denominator: revenue previous year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat accounting records.
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