

Executive Committee Meeting
Maputo, Mozambique
6 November 2011

Agenda Item No. 2: Independent Evaluation
Support Document: COWI Inception Report

Background:

At its July 2011 meeting, EXCO asked that COWI/AS present draft findings and recommendations from the 2011 Independent Evaluation of the Cities Alliance.

A representative from COWI/AS, Mr. Anders Richelsen, will review the draft findings and recommendations with EXCO.

Recommended Action:

- Provide feedback to COWI on presentation of draft findings.

Cities Alliance

Providing an Independent Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Cities Alliance

Inception Report

July 2011

COWI A/S

Parallelvej 2
DK-2800 Kongens Lyngby
Denmark

Tel +45 45 97 22 11
Fax +45 45 97 22 12
www.cowi.com

Cities Alliance

Providing an Independent Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Cities Alliance

Inception Report

July 2011

Project No. P-75726-A-1
Document no. 2
Version 1
Date of issue 8 July 2011

Prepared Anders Richelsen & Tom Dahl-Østergaard
Checked Niels Eilshøj Olesen
Approved Tom Dahl-Østergaard

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Updated Approach and Methodology	4
2.1	Approach	4
2.2	Methodology	10
3	Time Schedule	13

Table of Appendices

Appendix A: List of persons to be interviewed

Appendix B: Guide for interviews with CA members

Appendix C: Example of template to structure the analysis of previous evaluations

1 Introduction

This Inception Report updates the methodology and approach proposed in COWI's original tender.

The Inception Report is based on the agreements made between COWI and the Cities Alliance (CA) Secretariat during the contract negotiations and the information gathered and agreements made during the kick-off mission in Washington 27-29 June 2011.

At the contract negotiations on 13 May 2011, Mr Meinert from CA's Secretariat explained and emphasized Section B of the TOR, "Objectives of the Evaluation", and the logical build-up of the approach suggested for the Independent External Evaluation (IEE), starting from an aggregated impact evaluation and leading to formative recommendations, positioning the CA in the broader institutional context of urban development cooperation.

Furthermore, it was made clear that the budget allocated for the IEE is USD 120,000. As the budget presented in COWI's tender was USD 154,000, a significant cut has been made in the number of work days envisaged in the tender.

Prior to the signature of the contract a revised methodology and budget was agreed in order to:

- Put more emphasis on the position, role and justification of the CA in the broader context of the other institutional actors in urban international development (the formative dimension)
- Reduce the number of work days and include additional costs for a field mission to Uganda and/or Ghana.

At the kick-off mission in June the team carried out individual interviews, group interviews and a SWOT workshop with key staff in the secretariat. We also met with relevant staff of the World Bank as well as with representatives from USAID and Habitat for Humanity International.

The team would like to thank the Secretariat for a very well organized kick-off mission.

2 Updated Approach and Methodology

As the quantitative data on the results of projects is limited, and as the budget for the evaluation does not allow for the generation of primary data on project results, it has been agreed that the assessment of the aggregated outputs and outcomes of the CA will have to rely on previous evaluations and existing reports supplemented by a review of 10 project completion reports for the period 2007-2011.

In addition to the retrospective objective outlined above, the evaluation will include a systematic assessment of the CA members' views on the CA's new business model and the forthcoming business plan. It will also include a discussion of the role and contributions of other institutional actors in urban international development, as well as their perceptions of the CA.

In light of the above, and on the basis of the technical proposal in our tender and the agreed budget for the evaluation, the following sections present an updated and more detailed approach and methodology.

2.1 Approach

The tables below show how we intend to answer each of the evaluation questions of the Terms of Reference (TOR), which are organized according to the evaluation criteria: Relevance, efficacy, cost effectiveness, governance and management, resource mobilisation and sustainability. In other words, the tables include - as direct quotations – all the questions from the TOR (see the table's first column).

2.1.1 Relevance

The CA Secretariat has stressed the importance of the assessment of relevance, especially the assessment of the comparative advantages, value added and core competency of the CA relative to other multilateral and bilateral development programmes.

Evaluation questions from TOR	Judgement criteria	Data sources
<p>Demand-side relevance</p> <p>To what extent are the objectives and activities of the Cities Alliance consistent with the needs, priorities, and strategies of beneficiary cities and countries and global trends in urbanisation and urban development?</p> <p>To what extent has the voice of developing and transition countries been expressed in the international consensus underlying the Cities Alliance?</p>	<p>CA objectives and activities (new charter, three pillars of intervention as well as new business lines) are consistent with needs in beneficiary cities and countries.</p> <p>Urban slums are considered a problem in developing countries</p> <p>City Development Strategies (CDS) are considered necessary/potentially beneficial by cities in developing countries</p> <p>Slum upgrading as advocated by CA is considered (potentially) suitable by cities in developing countries</p> <p>Developing and transition countries have influenced Consultative Group (CG) and Executive Committee (ExCo) as well as the reform process</p> <p>CA members consider the voice of developing and transition countries is sufficiently represented.</p>	<p>Interviews with all CA members and selected project partners.</p> <p>Interviews with selected national city associations</p> <p>Interviews with other institutional actors in urban international development</p> <p>Previous evaluations of the CA.</p> <p>Literature review.</p> <p>Analysis of CG and ExCo deliberations</p> <p>Interviews with all CA members</p>
<p>Supply-side relevance</p> <p>What is the comparative advantage, value added, and core competency of the CA relative to other multi- and bilateral development programmes? What are the recommendations to the Cities Alliance to minimise duplications?</p>	<p>A high degree of coherence and complementarity exists between CA objectives and activities and objectives/activities of multilateral and bilateral actors</p> <p>Stakeholders find that activities of the CA work well together with, and do not duplicate, efforts of other donors/members.</p>	<p>Interviews with all CA members (including past members) and selected project partners.</p> <p>Interviews with selected national city associations.</p> <p>Interviews with other institutional actors in urban international development</p> <p>Previous evaluations of the CA.</p>
<p>Relevance of the design of the programme</p> <p>To what extent are the strategies and the activities of the programme, primarily as they are now expressed in the <i>new Business Model and the Business Plan</i> (rev TOR), appropriate for achieving its objectives?</p>	<p>A high degree of consistency in the "change logic" of the CA - the internal logic linking overall objectives with activities on the ground and the underlying assumptions</p>	<p>Interviews with all CA members and selected project partners.</p> <p>Desk study of Charter, Business Model and Business Plan</p>

2.1.2 Efficacy

The assessment of efficacy up to 2006 will be assessed based on the findings from previous evaluations. For the period after 2006, the assessment of project results will be based on the 2011 Evaluation of Project Implementation Modalities of the CA combined with a sample of ten completion reports, interviews with CA members and, to a limited extent, project partners.

Evaluation questions from TOR	Judgement criteria	Data sources
<p>Achievement of objectives</p> <p>To what extent have the stated objectives of the Alliance been achieved, or has satisfactory progress been made towards achieving these objectives?</p>	<p>Results fulfil the targets set for the CA as a whole</p> <p>CA contributes to creating synergies and leveraging of resources CA contributes to harmonisation of efforts</p> <p>CA members consider progress to be satisfactory</p>	<p>Previous evaluations of the CA (systematic review of reported results)</p> <p>Review and analysis of a sample of ten CA project completion reports</p> <p>Interviews with a sample of sponsoring CA members and some project partners.</p> <p>Review of all field evaluation reports from 2007-2011</p>
<p>Progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes</p> <p>On an aggregated level, what were the main outputs and outcomes of the CA in the past five years?</p> <p>To what extent are the new Charter, the new business model, the modified governance structure and modified administrative processes expected to affect the outputs and outcomes of the partnership in the future?</p> <p>How did, and how should the Cities Alliance in the future, aggregate its outputs and outcomes at all levels—global, regional, national, and local—to provide an overall summary reports of its results and to address the risk of fragmentation?</p>	<p>Aggregated results which can be attributed to CA activities. Results of each of the three pillars of intervention + advocacy + knowledge sharing.</p> <p>Perception of changes in the CA and expectations for the future of CA members, partner cities/governments and the Secretariat.</p> <p>Usefulness of M&E system and indicators for aggregating results</p> <p>Communicative value of previous reports</p>	<p>Review of results as summarised in CA reports (e.g. annual reports)</p> <p>Interviews with all CA members and the CA Secretariat.</p> <p>Assessment of previous efforts to establish an M&E system</p> <p>Previous evaluations of the CA</p>

2.1.3 Cost-effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness has only to a limited extent been the subject of study in the previous evaluations of the CA. This evaluation also has a limited scope in this respect and focuses mainly on overhead costs of management and transaction costs. An assessment of the efficiency of the projects funded is not within the scope of this evaluation.

Evaluation questions from TOR	Judgement criteria	Data sources
<p>Cost-effectiveness</p> <p>Are the overhead costs of governing and managing the Cities Alliance reasonable and appropriate in relation to the objectives, activities and services? The analysis should take the current efforts of streamlining of processes into account.</p> <p>For beneficiary countries, has receiving the development assistance through the CA caused additional or reduced transactions costs compared with traditional development assistance programmes? If so, how and why?</p> <p>For CA members, has delivering the development assistance through the CA reduced costs by harmonising efforts among development partners or by reducing overlapping work (such as through joint supervision, monitoring and evaluation)? On the other hand, how do CA transaction costs compare to members' transaction costs?</p>	<p>Overhead costs stable or decreasing compared to previous years or increase can be explained by additional tasks</p> <p>Overhead costs similar to or lower than other similar partnerships/funding mechanisms</p> <p>Overhead costs considered reasonable by CA members</p> <p>CA SEC consider that possibilities for lowering costs have been captured</p> <p>CA members' and project partners' consider level of transaction costs and degree to which these have been reduced through harmonisation of efforts/reduction of overlapping work to be satisfactory</p>	<p>Comparison of annual administrative overhead costs (administration cost in % of grant budget) to overhead costs in previous years and overhead costs in the WB and in other global partnership programmes</p> <p>Interviews with all CA members and the CA Secretariat.</p> <p>Interviews with a sample of sponsoring CA members and some project partners</p> <p>Interviews with all CA members.</p> <p>Previous evaluations of the CA</p>

2.1.4 Governance and management

The assessment of governance and management will focus on the new structures established in 2010 and check whether they reflect good governance principles and shortcomings discussed in previous evaluations. Furthermore, pros and cons related to the WB hosting of the CA will be discussed.

Evaluation questions from TOR	Judgement criteria	Data sources
<p>Compliance with generally accepted principles of good governance</p> <p>To what extent are the governance and management structures (Consultative Group, Executive Committee and Secretariat) and processes well articulated and working well to bring about legitimate and effective governance and management?</p> <p>To what extent do governance and management practices comply with the principles of good governance, such as Legitimacy, Accountability, Responsibility, Fairness, Transparency, Efficiency, and Probity?</p>	<p>Governance and management structures permit and facilitate the effective participation and voice of the different categories of stakeholders in the major governance and management decisions, taking into account their respective roles and relative importance.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities are clear</p> <p>Acceptance and exercising of social responsibility</p> <p>Equal opportunities for partners and participants</p> <p>Decision-making, reporting and evaluation processes open and freely available</p> <p>Efficiency in use of resources and possible trade-offs with legitimacy</p> <p>High standards of ethics</p> <p>Governance is effective in comparison to other similar international programmes</p>	<p>Review of previous and present charter</p> <p>Review of previous evaluations.</p> <p>Review of CG and ExCo deliberations</p> <p>Review of procedures for evaluating project proposals</p> <p>Review of annual reports</p> <p>Interviews with all CA members and the CA Secretariat</p>
<p>Programmes located in host organisations</p> <p>To what extent is the location of the CA Secretariat in the Bank affecting the prioritisation of activities, governance, management, or other aspects of the CA?</p> <p>To what extent does the role of the Bank in the programme affect the incentives of other partners to participate effectively?</p>	<p>The location of the CA in the Bank affects positively on activities through synergy, etc.</p> <p>The location of the CA in the Bank does not compromise performance, transparency, or fairness</p>	<p>Interviews with all CA members and the CA Secretariat.</p> <p>Review of minutes and reports from CG and ExCo meetings</p> <p>Annual data on the time it takes to process an application through the funding cycle in accordance with the established (WB) procedures</p>

2.1.5 Resource mobilisation

Evaluation questions from TOR	Judgement criteria	Data sources
<p>To what extent are the sources and conditions of funding for the Cities Alliance affecting, positively or negatively, its governance, management or sustainability?</p>	<p>The link between governance and financing is suitable and does not prevent potential stakeholders from participating</p> <p>The CG is exercising its role in an appropriate manner providing guidance, setting rules and staying open to new possibilities</p> <p>Financial reporting and auditing are satisfactory to all contributors</p> <p>There is a reasonable trade-off between the disadvantages associated with tied funding (constraints to prioritization) and the benefits achieved.</p>	<p>Interviews with all CA members (including previous ones)</p> <p>Data on level of annual contribution</p>

2.1.6 Sustainability

Evaluation questions from TOR	Judgement criteria	Data sources
<p>Prospects for continuation</p> <p>In what areas could the CA improve in order to enhance its sustainability?</p> <p>What should be considered to sustain the CA's results more cost-effectively, in light of the findings of previous evaluations?</p>	<p>The range and depth of political commitment, support and financing for the CA and its objectives are sustainable.</p> <p>Continuing demand for the CA - in the light of the new charter and the new business model.</p> <p>The CA has a unique role and comparative advantage in urban development architecture, which is likely to continue in the future given the new charter/business model</p> <p>Identification of areas for improvement based on analysis of relevance, efficacy, governance and management (see above), in particular legitimacy.</p> <p>Identification of areas for improvement based on analysis of cost-effectiveness and comparison with previous evaluations</p>	<p>New charter/business model</p> <p>Interviews with all CA members</p> <p>Number of project applications processed / approved</p> <p>Previous evaluations</p>

2.2 Methodology

Desk research

Structured analysis of previous evaluations of the CA

The previous evaluations of the CA will be analysed to elicit their assessments with regard to all the evaluation questions posed in this evaluation. This will be summarised in a tabular form, which allows for comparison of evaluation results across the evaluations for each specific question. The table shown in Appendix C illustrates how this may be approached and provides an overview of the 2006 evaluation and the 2007 Global Programme Review (GPR) according to each evaluation theme of this evaluation.

Analysis of 10 completion reports

In order to assess the efficacy of project implementation in the period after 2006 we will, as mentioned above, analyse a somewhat randomized sample of ten completion reports. As we want the sample to reflect the geographical focus and thematic scope of the portfolio of CA projects after 2006, we will draw the sample accordingly. In other words, the sample will be purposive but include an element of randomization.

Review of all field evaluation reports from 2007-2011

Each year the CA Secretariat carries out field evaluations. The reports from these evaluations will be reviewed in order to further substantiate the assessment of efficiency.

Analysis of key institutional actors in urban development cooperation

In order to understand the broader institutional context of urban development cooperation and CA's position within this context, we will study the policies, strategies and activities of key actors and financing institutions. These will include CA members as well as non-members such as ADB, IDB, JICA, and some NGOs. The analysis will also include the typical delivery mechanisms and set-ups which characterise urban development cooperation.

Furthermore, data on similar international programmes may be used as benchmarks (e.g. in comparison of overhead costs) and/or as basis for learning.

Interviews

Interviews with CA members

All members of the CA will be interviewed. Interviews will focus on getting a broader view of results achieved by the CA as well as the functioning of the CA in the light of the reform process and perceptions of relevance and sustainability of the CA. Most interviews will be conducted by phone. Personal interviews will, to the extent possible, be arranged with members of the ExCo at the Committee's meeting in Accra July 11-13. The interviews will include each member organisations' headquarter staff responsible for the collaboration with the CA. An interview guide outlining the questions to be asked to the members is attached as Appendix B.

At the Kick-off meeting in Washington June 27-29 interviews were carried out with USAID and Habitat for Humanity International

For each of the ten completed projects we are going to analyse, we will interview the responsible staff of one of the sponsoring member organisations.

Interviews with Cities and national associations of cities

In order to get the Cities perspective on the CA's work we will interview approximately five cities and five national associations of cities. In addition to their overall view of the CA, we will use these interviews to qualify our assessment of the ten projects completed after 2006, mentioned above. Thus, the cities and associations of cities to be included will be selected from the project sample.

Interviews CA Secretariat

At the Kick-off mission a number of interviews with members of the CA secretariat were conducted, cf. Appendix A. Supplementary interviews will be carried out by phone as necessary.

Interviews country programmes

In order to fully understand and assess the concept of country programmes we will carry out interviews with the key country programme stakeholders in Ghana in connection with the ExCo meeting July 11-13. We will supplement these interviews with telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders in some of the other countries where country programmes have been introduced. If necessary, a short field trip (2-3 working days) could be organised to Uganda or Ghana.

Analysis and reporting

The analysis will be performed in accordance with the framework of evaluation questions and judgement criteria. Data collected will be used to validate (or negate) the judgement criteria, which will feed into the analysis of the evaluation questions and the formulation of conclusions and recommendations.

Data triangulation

The advantage of involving a number of data sources and data collection methods is that the evaluation conclusions are strengthened after a process of triangulation, where specific findings are compared and judged in relation to findings from other sources of information in order to establish to which extent the findings can be considered general and valid. The process of triangulation is composed of four steps:

- Identify trends across the data, gather information and consolidating these observations;
- Check consistency between different sources of information to look for contradictions;
- If necessary; look for additional data in order to analyse and explain possible contradictions and/or differences in the findings from the various sources of information;
- Test hypotheses and formulate conclusions.

Involvement of ExCo/CG

The scope and methodology was presented to and discussed with ExCo at its meeting in Accra in July.

The ToR foresees a discussion with ExCo about trends and conditions of international cooperation. However, no further ExCo meetings scheduled during the evaluation period.

The draft findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the CG at its meeting in Maputo in November 2011.

Final report

The final report will provide the findings and evidence to support these along with resulting conclusions and recommendations.

The final report will draw together the findings pertaining to each evaluation criterion and will present conclusions reflecting on the principal objectives of the evaluation, which are to:

- Achieve an overall understanding of the coherence between the CA's corporate objectives, its strategy and instruments, its means of operation, and the results achieved so far, and thereby help to:
- Identify the CA's role and comparative advantage in the international architecture in urban development.

This, in turn, will lead to concrete recommendations on how CA's strategic position in the overall urban development architecture can be best reflected in the business plan.

3 Time Schedule

	2011						
/ activity	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Inception phase	[Blue arrow spanning June to July]						
Kick-off mission	[Red bar]						
ExCo meeting Ghana		[Red bar]					
Refining methodology and activities	[Red bar]						
Collecting available data and documents	[Red bar]						
Preparation of inception report	[Red bar]						
Draft inception report		[Blue triangle]					
CA comments to inception report		[Red bar]					
Final inception report			[Blue triangle]				
Data collection phase	[Blue arrow spanning July to September]						
Literature review		[Red bar]					
Analysis of previous evaluations		[Red bar]					
Desk review of 10 completion reports			[Red bar]				
Finalisation of interview guides		[Red bar]					
Semi-structured interviews with CA members and other stakeholders			[Red bar]				
Analysis and reporting	[Blue arrow spanning September to December]						
Final analysis and drafting of final report					[Red bar]	[Blue triangle]	
Presentation of draft findings and conclusions to CG in Maputo						[Black dot]	
Finalisation of report base on comments received						[Red bar]	
Final evaluation report							[Blue triangle]

Appendix A: List of persons to be interviewed

The table below shows who we intend to interview within the different categories of stakeholders

Institution	Contact person	Telephone	e-mail	Date for interview
CA secretariat	William Cobbett, Manager	202-458 9657	wcobbett@citalliance.org	27-29.6 2011 (Kick-off Mission)
	Kevin Millroy	202-473 5264	Kmilroy@citiesalliance.org	
	Gunter Meinert	202-458 0309	gmeinert@citiesalliance.org	
	Phyllis Kibui	202-473 9738	pkibui@CitiesAlliance.org	
	Madhavan Balachandran	202-473 8129	mbalachandran@citiesalliance.org	
	Oksana Mushtatenko	202-473 9497	omushtatenko@worldbank.org	
	Erika Puspa	202-458 4675	epuspa@citiesalliance.org	
	Rodolfo Gaspar	202-458 5332	rgaspar1@citiesalliance.org	
	Juliet Bunch	202-458 8695	jbunch@citiesalliance.org	
	Rene Hohmann	202-473-8366	rhohmann@citiesalliance.org	
	Federico Silva	202-473-3369	fsilva@citiesalliance.org	
	Chii Akporji	202-473 1935	cakporji@citiesalliance.org	
	Andrea Zeman	202- 458 2503	azeman@citiesalliance.org	

	Susanna Henderson	202-458-7239		
Members of the CA				
United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)	Emilia Saiz	34 93 342 8761	e.saiz@cities-localgovernments.org	
Metropolis	Josep Roig	34 93 342-9460	jroig@metropolis.org	
AusAID (Australia)	Craig Gilbert	+61 2 6206 4839	Craig.Gilbert@ausaid.gov.au	
Ministério Das Cidades (Brazil)	Ines Magalhaes	+55 61 2108-1929/1912	imagalhaes@cidades.gov.br	
CAIXA Econômica Federal (Brazil)	Jorge Hereda	55 61 3206-9816/9876	jorge.hereda@caixa.gov.br, presidencia@caixa.gov.br	
Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo (MINVU) (Chile)	Rodrigo Perez Mackenna, David Silva Johnson (contact)	56 2 3513099	rodrigo.perez@minvu.cl , dsilva@minvu.cl	
Ministry of Works and Urban Development (Ethiopia)	Ato Abuye Aneley	25 11 554 0635	udss@ethionet.et	
Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (France)	Emilie Maehara	331 43 17 64 45	emilie.maehara@diplomatie.gouv.fr	
Agence Française de Développement (AfD)	Samuel Lefevre	33 1 5344 3582	lefevres@afd.fr	
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) (Germany)	Franz Marré	49 228 9953-53783	franz.marre@bmz.bund.de	

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Italy)	Loredana Stalteri	39 6 3691-6281	loredana.stalteri@esteri.it	
Ministry of Works, Housing and Urban Development (Nigeria)	Edna Deimi Tobi	(+234) 803 305 1952	ednatobi@hotmail.com	
Utenriksdepartement (Norway)	Erik Berg	47 22 243-972	erik.berg@mfa.no	
Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC) (Philippines)	Celia Alba; Technical Staff - Ms. Len Barrientos	6 32 811-4168	celsalba@yahoo.com ; lenbarrientos@yahoo.com	
League of Cities of the Philippines (LCP) (Philippines)	Jeremy Philippe Nishimori	+63-2-470-6837/ 6813/6843	Jtn.lcp@gmail.com	
National Department of Human Settlements (South Africa)	Neville Chainee	+27 12 421 1603	neville.chainee@dhs.gov.za	
Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID) (Spain)	Augustin Navarro de Vincente-Gella		augstin.navarro@meh.es	
SIDA (Sweden)	Mikael Atterhog	+46 8 698-5472	mikael.atterhog@sida.se	
DFID (UK)	Stephen Young	+44 20 7023 1963	s-young@dfid.gov.uk	
USAID (USA)	Jessica E Rosen, Team Leader, Urban Programs	202-712 5624	jrosen@usaid.gov	28.6.2011
	Nancy Leahy			28.6.2011

U.S. Department of State				
DG DEV (EU)	Christophe Fleureau-Dauloudet	+32 2 29 80 553	<Christophe.FLEUREAU-DAULOUDET@ec.europa.eu>	
Habitat for Humanity International	Steve Weir	+404 733 3102	sweir@habitat.org	
Slum Dwellers International (SDI)	Joel Bolnick	+ 27 21 689 9408	bolnick@courc.co.za	
UN-Habitat	Alioune Badiane	+254 207 623075	alioune.badaine@unhabitat.org	
UNEP	Soraya Smaoun	+ 44 37 19 80	Soraya.Smaoun@unep.org	
The World Bank	Judy Baker, Lead Economist World Bank Institute-Urban	202-473-7243	Jbaker2@worldbank.org	29.6.2001 (Lunch meeting)
	Andre Hezog Sr. Urban Specialist World Bank Institute	202-458-2683	aherzog@worldbank.org	
	Rumana Huque Sr. Urban Specialist Africa Urban	202-473-4682	rhuque@worldbank.org	
	John Morton Sr. Urban Environment Latin America	202-473-4879	jmorton@worldbank.org	

	Urban			
	Madhu Raghunath Sr. Urban Specialist MENA urban	202-458-7630	mraghunath@worldbank.org	
	Bernice K Van Bronkhorst Sr. Urban Specialist South Asia Urban	202-473-7877	bvanbronkhorst@worldbank.org	
	Junaid Ahmad, Sector Manager, Africa Urban Development	202-458-8470		29.6.2001
Associated Members				
ILO				
UNDP				
Past Members				
ADB	K. Seetharam; Michael Lindfield	+63 2 632-5610 +63 2 362-6833	kseetharam@adb.org ; mlindfield@adb.org	
Canada	Wassala Nimaga	+1 819 953-8194	wassala_nimaga@acdi-cida.gc.ca	
Ministry of Land, Infrastructure & Transport (Japan)	Mr. Okuda	+81 3 5253-8111	Okuda-E86Gr@Mlit.Go.Jp	
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken	Frits van der Wal, Sustainable		frits-vander.wal@minbuza.nl	

(Netherlands)	Econ Dev Dept			
Other Donors				
To be decided				
Associations of Cities				
To be decided				
Cities				
To be decided				

Appendix B: Guide for interviews with CA members

The following questions should be answered by all CA members.

- 1 What is the core competency of the CA relative to other multilateral and bilateral development programmes, and other relevant international development partners?
- 2 What is the comparative advantage and value added, of the CA relative to other multilateral and bilateral development programmes, and other relevant international development partners?
- 3 To what extent has the following CA activities been consistent with the needs, priorities and strategies of the beneficiary countries and cities:
 - 3.1 City Development Strategies?
 - 3.2 Slum upgrading?
- 4 Do you find that the following activities, as defined in the new charter, is the right way to meet the objectives of the CA as well as the needs of the beneficiary countries and cities:
 - 4.1 Country programmes?
 - 4.2 Catalytic projects?
 - 4.3 Knowledge activities?
 - 4.4 Communication support and advocacy?
- 5 Has the voice of the developing and transition countries been sufficiently expressed in the reform process?
- 6 Do the activities of the CA work well together with the activities of multilateral and bilateral actors or is there an undesirable overlap between these activities?
- 7 How do you expect the following elements in the reform process to affect the outputs and outcomes of the CA:
 - 7.1 The new charter?
 - 7.2 The new business model?
 - 7.3 The modified governance structure?
 - 7.4 The modified administrative processes?

- 8 Is CA monitoring and evaluation of results satisfactory?
- 9 Does the CA communicate the aggregated results of its activities in a satisfactory way?
- 10 Do you find the level overhead costs of governing and managing the CA reasonable?
- 11 Do you find that delivering development assistance through the CA reduce costs by harmonising efforts among the development partners or by reducing overlapping work (such as joint supervision, monitoring and evaluation)?
- 12 How do transaction costs compare to the transaction costs of your organisation?
- 13 Are roles and responsibilities of the different governing bodies (ExCo, C.G, and Secretariat) of the CA clear?
- 14 Do find the possibilities to influence major governance and management decisions satisfactory?
- 15 Do the governance and management structures in general permit and facilitate effective participation and the voice of different categories of stakeholders in the major governance and management decisions?
- 16 How does the location of the CA in the WB influence CA operations and performance?
- 17 What is your opinion of the size of the member fee?
- 18 What is your opinion of the size or the amount of recourses available to the CA?
- 19 Are financial reporting and auditing satisfactory?
- 20 Is there a reasonable trade-off between the disadvantages associated with tied funding (constraints to prioritization) and the benefits achieved?
- 21 What will be decisive for your organisation to continue to be a member in the future?

Appendix C: Example of template to structure the analysis of previous evaluations

Evaluation criteria	Guiding questions	2006 Independent evaluation	2007 Global Program Review
Relevance	<p>Demand-side relevance: Alignment with beneficiary needs, priorities, and strategies</p> <p>To what extent are the objectives and activities of the Cities Alliance consistent with the needs, priorities, and strategies of beneficiary cities and countries and global trends in urbanisation and urban development?</p> <p>To what extent has the voice of developing and transition countries been expressed in the international consensus underlying the Cities Alliance?</p>	<p>Members and stakeholders confirm CA relevance</p> <p>Substance addressed and approach are still relevant</p> <p>CA needs to work more closely with cities themselves</p>	<p>Not having the voice of individual cities heard at the CG is a void</p>
	<p>Supply-side relevance</p> <p>What is the comparative advantage, value added, and core competency of the CA relative to other multi- and bilateral development programmes? What are the recommendations to the Cities Alliance to minimise duplications?</p>	<p>CA is a unique forum to facilitate interactions between various interest groups</p>	<p>The CA's convening power among cities</p> <p>The CA has greater flexibility than other donors with their own agendas of urban cooperation</p>
	<p>Relevance of the design of the programme</p> <p>To what extent are the strategies, including its results chain ("Approach to Change") and the activities of the programme, primarily as expressed in the Medium-Term Strategy and the Work Plan, appropriate for achieving its objectives?</p>	<p>Focus on CDS and SU is appropriate</p> <p>Municipal finance is a necessary complement</p>	<p>Tight and consistent focus on CDS and SU positive feature (municipal finance not seen as necessary complement)</p> <p>Slimmed down SEC provides for agility in response to demands</p>

Evaluation criteria	Guiding questions	2006 Independent evaluation	2007 Global Program Review
Efficacy (effectiveness)	Achievement of objectives To what extent have the stated objectives of the Alliance been achieved, or has satisfactory progress been made towards achieving these objectives?		CA objective statement unclear about what is to be achieved. Imprecise / unrealistic formulation of objectives. A log-frame linking actions to results could help point the way. 2006 evaluation not sufficiently weighted to results-based assessment and did not give critical feed-back on CA objectives.
	<i>To improve the quality of urban development cooperation and urban lending</i>	CA activities led to greater coordination and coherence among partners Alliance grants have strengthened local capacity but this is not institutionalised	Objective would benefit from revision Anecdotal evidence exists, but with the limited data and evaluation work done so far, it is not possible to answer the question about the counterfactual (what would happen without the CA)
	<i>To strengthen the impact of grant-funded urban development cooperation</i>	Scaling up remains a challenge but CA activities have contributed to replication on a higher scale Impact of CA on the ground is affected by local leadership, intergovernmental relationships, capacities and opportunities CA has raised the profile of urban issues Alliance provides opportunities for capacity building according to municipalities and communities	Evidence exists. Replication to a larger scale esp for SU. CA has helped retain high profile of urban issues among donors. Many concrete examples of impact of CA's TA for SU and CDS.
	<i>To expand the level of resources reaching the urban poor, by increasing the coherence of effort of existing programmes and sharpening the focus on scaling up successful approaches</i>	Alliance grants of USD 80 million have leveraged USD 8.2 billion in investments	The 2006 evaluation does not explain how this investment can be attributed to CA TA, how the amount was estimated, or how much went to the poor. Individual examples are widely reported, but the CA could make more efforts to marshal concrete evidence and systematically explaining the results chain.

Evaluation criteria	Guiding questions	2006 Independent evaluation	2007 Global Program Review
	<p><i>To provide a structured vehicle for advancing collective know-how</i></p>	<p>CA still needs a strategy for learning and advocacy, focused more on the process of exchange than on instruments</p> <p>CA grants have helped knowledge sharing and networking among cities, but more could be done</p> <p>CA needs to maximise knowledge sharing through municipal associations</p> <p>CA has unique niche for building social capital</p>	<p>Objective formulation is imprecise</p> <p>The CA has yet to fully realize its potential as <i>the</i> global community of practise in assisting urban development for the poor in CDS/SU.</p> <p>Dual responsibility for the CA: SEC as advocate of best practise techniques, CG members as advocates of the key role of cities in economic and social development</p>
	<p>Progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes</p> <p>On an aggregated level, what were the main outputs and outcomes of the CA in the past five years? To what extent are the new Charter, the new business model, the modified governance structure and modified administrative processes expected to affect the outputs and outcomes of the partnership in the future?</p> <p>How did, and how should the Cities Alliance in the future, aggregate its outputs and outcomes at all levels—global, regional, national, and local—to provide an overall summary reports of its results and to address the risk of fragmentation?</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>

Evaluation criteria	Guiding questions	2006 Independent evaluation	2007 Global Program Review
<p>Cost-effectiveness (efficiency)</p>	<p>Cost-effectiveness</p> <p>Are the overhead costs of governing and managing the Cities Alliance reasonable and appropriate in relation to the objectives, activities and services? The analysis should take the current efforts of streamlining of processes into account.</p> <p>For beneficiary countries, has receiving the development assistance through the CA caused additional or reduced transactions costs compared with traditional development assistance programmes? If so, how and why?</p> <p>For CA members, has delivering the development assistance through the CA reduced costs by harmonising efforts among development partners or by reducing overlapping work (such as through joint supervision, monitoring and evaluation)? On the other hand, how do CA transaction costs compare to members' transaction costs?</p>	<p>Overhead costs of about 16%, which is acceptable to members.</p> <p>The SEC has remained a small core group with significant esprit de corps, which has enabled it to facilitate the work of the CA in an efficient fashion.</p> <p>Capacity constraints within the SEC prevents it from taking greater responsibility for tasks such as knowledge dissemination.</p>	<p>SEC staff small. Overhead of 12.2 per cent of the total value of grants approved - similar to WB.</p> <p>Need for other means to measure efficiency of CA and its TA: Parameters for cost-effectiveness of TA for different sizes of cities, for instance.</p> <p>2006 evaluation provides few answers on efficiency.</p>

Evaluation criteria	Guiding questions	2006 Independent evaluation	2007 Global Program Review
<p>Governance and management</p>	<p>Compliance with generally accepted principles of good governance</p> <p>To what extent are the governance and management structures (Consultative Group, Executive Committee and Secretariat) and processes well articulated and working well to bring about legitimate and effective governance and management?</p> <p>To what extent do governance and management practices comply with the principles of good governance, such as Legitimacy, Accountability, Responsibility, Fairness, Transparency, Efficiency, and Probity?</p>	<p>Governance:</p> <p>Need for clearer definitions of roles of certain functions within the Alliance governance structure</p> <p>Adding recipient countries to CG is good but brings some ambiguity to Alliance governance</p> <p>CG support for current decision making process and implementation by SEC</p> <p>Bank/Habitat partnership for Alliance is commended but tension between these partners do affect the Alliance</p> <p>Need to clarify the mandate of the SC</p> <p>Need to update vision of the PAB</p> <p>Current allocation of corporate authorities within the Alliance under resources key activities</p> <p>The Alliance lacks an accountability relationship between SEC, CG and SC. The Alliance is creating a brand, but it is sometime difficult to distinguish it from the Bank</p> <p>The Alliance is a very relevant forum for most Members of CG</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>Members trust and highly regard the SEC</p> <p>Members think that Alliance grant approval process is ok, but some clients find it too lengthy</p> <p>The Alliance review of proposals generally works well, but there are some weaknesses</p> <p>Some progress with Alliance M&E at project level, but more needed</p> <p>The Alliance lacks mechanisms for aggregating at thematic level and for assessing overall Alliance performance</p>	<p>Governance:</p> <p>Cities should be better represented</p> <p>Need to clarify role of SC and make PAB into a true expert panel</p> <p>SEC accountability: potential conflicts of interest arising from relationship with the WB. CA should consider specific steps to make it more distinct from the WB.</p> <p>Further diversification of the CG more complicated but worthwhile.</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>SEC is well managed</p> <p>Annual report could do more to inform readers about CA activities and achievements and compare to plans</p> <p>Management of applications need to be more transparent and fully under CA control</p> <p>Annual reporting should be more transparent providing financial values for the year in question and detailed on activities</p>

Evaluation criteria	Guiding questions	2006 Independent evaluation	2007 Global Program Review
	<p>Programmes located in host organisations</p> <p>To what extent is the location of the CA Secretariat in the Bank affecting the prioritisation of activities, governance, management, or other aspects of the CA?</p> <p>To what extent does the role of the Bank in the programme affect the incentives of other partners to participate effectively?</p>	<p>CA Members are satisfied with Bank's management of its Trust Fund (#27)</p>	<p>Potential conflict of interests as the WB entity exercises oversight of WB participation in the CA - as co-chair of the CG and as line manager to whom the CA's program manager reports.</p>
Resource mobilisation	<p>Resource mobilisation</p> <p>To what extent are the sources and conditions of funding for the Cities Alliance affecting, positively or negatively, its governance, management or sustainability?</p>	<p>Shift toward sub-Saharan Africa and global initiatives (#2)</p> <p>Poorer and weaker cities do not have access to Alliance funding according to some stakeholders (#3)</p>	<p>Stable and consistent funding. 18 donors reduces risks.</p>
Sustainability	<p>Prospects for continuation</p> <p>In what areas could the CA improve in order to enhance its sustainability?</p> <p>What should be considered to sustain the CA's results more cost-effectively, in light of the findings of previous evaluations?</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>	<p>Demand, high relevance and appreciation, stable funding point to longer-term sustainability of the CA.</p>

