



# **IV Interim Management Board Meeting Report**

**17 February 2016**

**Brussels, BELGIUM**

## **Contents**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. Decisions .....   | 3  |
| II. Meeting Summary.....   | 4  |
| Item 1: Opening and Welcome .....                                  | 4  |
| Director's Report.....   | 5  |
| Item 2: Report on Standing Committees .....                        | 6  |
| a. Finance Committee Report.....                                   | 6  |
| b. Membership Standing Committee Report.....                       | 9  |
| Item 3: Partnership Strategy.....                                  | 12 |
| Item 4: Preparations for Cities Alliance Assembly Meeting .....    | 15 |
| Item 5: MTS Updates .....  | 18 |
| a) JWP Equitable Economic Growth .....                             | 18 |
| b) JWP Habitat III .....   | 20 |
| ANNEXES .....  | 21 |
| Annex I: List of Attendees .....                                   | 21 |
| Annex II: IV IMB Meeting Agenda .....                              | 22 |
| Annex III: DRAFT Finance Standing Committee Meeting Minutes .....  | 24 |
| Annex IV: DRAFT Membership Standing Committee Meeting Minutes..... | 32 |

## **I. Decisions**

- 1. The draft meeting Agenda was adopted.**
- 2. The 3rd IMB Meeting Report was approved with one amendment.**
- 3. The Cities Alliance MTS should be reviewed after Habitat III.**
- 4. The draft Risk Management Framework was approved. The Secretariat will incorporate the recommendations of the Management Board.**
- 5. The ToR for the Cities Alliance Audit was approved.**
- 6. The Board approved the Membership Guide and the Membership Planning Tool which need to be updated slightly to incorporate recommendations of the Membership Committee and the Board.**
- 7. The Secretariat will prepare a recommendation regarding Membership Fees for National Governments.**
- 8. Membership applications from New York University and Ford Foundation were endorsed for Full Membership, and UNISDR was endorsed for Associate Membership.**
- 9. The Secretariat will prepare a Recommendation Note on the appointment process of the new Management Board.**
- 10. First version of draft agenda for the inaugural meeting of the Cities Alliance Assembly was approved.**
- 11. The Interim Management Board will recommend potential candidates for the position of Management Board Chair, and the Secretariat will come up with proposals.**
- 12. The Secretariat will prepare a Recommendation to accommodate the specific need of “Sustaining Members”.**
- 13. The Secretariat will draft a detailed Recommendation Note highlighting the nomination and appointment process, as well as potential candidates, for the position of Assembly Chairperson.**
- 14. The Interim Management Board recommends that the Assembly appoint two to three Senior Policy Advisers.**
- 15. Amendments to Paragraphs 22, 32, 42 and 43 of the Cities Alliance Charter were approved. The amendments will be presented to the Assembly for ratification.**
- 16. The Country Selection document of JWP EEG was endorsed, and Uganda was retained in the first instance.**

## **II. Meeting Summary**

**Date:** 17 February 2016

**Attendance:** *(See Annex I for full list of Members in the meeting.)*

**Venue:** *Cities Alliance, Rue Royale 94, 1000 Brussels, Belgium*

### **Item 1: Opening and Welcome**

The fourth meeting of the Cities Alliance Interim Management Board was opened by Mr. Jean Pierre Elong Mbassi, Chairperson. Regrets were received from Ethiopia and UCLG, who were unable to attend the meeting. The Members of the Interim Management Board welcomed the new representative from DFID, Melinda Bohannon, Deputy Director, Head of Growth and Resilience Department, and a round of introductions was made.

The Chair welcomed all members and mentioned that minor changes had been made to the agenda to accommodate member requests, and that Brazil would join the meeting in the afternoon session only due to the time difference.

The Chair presented the draft meeting agenda and the draft IMB October Meeting Report for comments and approval. The draft meeting agenda was adopted. For the draft IMB October Meeting Report, an amendment on pp. 23-24 was proposed to remove the note regarding the lobbying process for the post of the next UN Secretary General. Members agreed with the amendment, and the third IMB Meeting Report was approved.

#### **DECISIONS**

- 1. The draft meeting Agenda was adopted.**
- 2. The third IMB Meeting Report was approved with one amendment.**

## **Director's Report**

The November-December report was circulated to the Members in advance of the meeting, highlighting the Secretariat's main activities over the past two months. Cities Alliance Director William Cobbett provided verbal updates on several key strategic issues, including the Gates LSC portfolio closure in October 2016 with few high risk grants such as Burkina Faso; Gates Intermediation Portfolio closure in March 2017; the expected completion of the Future Cities Africa programme in May-June 2016, with a significant intellectual output expected for the second quarter of the year; and Comic Relief approval of a £ 3,94 million grant for a five-year Liberia Country Programme. The framework document is finalised and several Members will be involved in the implementation of the Liberia programme (SDI, HFHI, WIEGO, UN-Habitat). Simultaneously, the Secretariat engaged with the UK embassy in Liberia for possible leverage of funds to support economic growth.

Next, the Director reported that the Cities Alliance was approached by the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI) to apply for a Complementary Membership for 2016. Cities Alliance was asked to join the Built Environment track to bring a focus on slum upgrading. CGI has over 900 members and is organised around two main business lines – it convenes a global annual meeting of key thought leaders, and it requires members to make “Commitments to Action”. These commitments help CGI members translate practical goals into meaningful and measureable results. The Cities Alliance submitted the Liberia Country Programme as our Commitment to Action.

The importance of the upcoming Cities Alliance Assembly meeting was underlined once again. It will essentially mark the end of a period of sustained organisational reforms, with several significant decisions and the beginning of the next period for the Cities Alliance.

Members referred to the Partnership Strategy and complimented UCLGA for the success of Africities Summit and the Cities Alliance involvement at COP 21. Recognising the big opportunities of the changing aid architecture and the New Urban Agenda, several Members underlined the importance of anticipating the future of the organisation as a strengthened and more ambitious alliance that would play a bigger role influencing policy rather than getting tied into traditional work programme. In this context the Director underlined the necessity of securing

long-term core funding with an assertive fundraising strategy to build capacity for long-term engagement in the field. Members agreed on the need to review the Cities Alliance MTS through a post-Quito lens.

**DECISION**

**3. The Cities Alliance MTS should be reviewed after Habitat III.**

## **Item 2: Report on Standing Committees**

### **a. Finance Committee Report**

The Finance Standing Committee held its third meeting on 16 February 2016 immediately prior to the Board meeting. The meeting was attended by the following members: Steve Weir (HFHI, Chair); Mikael Atterhög (Sida); Clare Short (Senior Policy Advisor); and Jean-Pierre Elong Mbassi (Chair, Cities Alliance Interim Management Board).

The Chair of the Committee presented the highlights of the discussion and several recommendations to the Management Board.<sup>1</sup> The Committee scrutinised and provided feedback on the ToR for the Cities Alliance Audit, the updated draft Risk Management Framework (RMF), the overview of UNOPS fees, and the 2016 Budget.

It was noted that due to the January 2016 UNOPS transition to a new ERP system the final actuals for 2015 and the certified financial statements will only be available in April 2016. However, no material changes are expected. The Committee noted that Cities Alliance was depleting the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Draft Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting are attached in Annex III.*

reserve quickly and an action plan for reallocating some expenses was required to slow down the burn rate. The Committee recommended that “fund accounting” procedures be adopted to track and reallocate the costs between core and non-core funds to provide the necessary back-up reserves. The Committee requested that the Secretariat prepare two scenarios: one conservative and one optimistic. The Committee agreed that it was important to thoroughly review the 2016 mid-year financials and take appropriate action. The Secretariat will prepare a proposal of different ways to allocate costs (especially staff costs) for the Committee’s review. The Committee requested that the full FY2016 budget be analysed and reviewed at the next meeting. After analysing the summary of UNOPS management fees and direct allocable costs, it was noted that while UNOPS charges are much higher than those of the World Bank, the services are not comparable – it is perceived that Cities Alliance is receiving fewer services at a higher price. The Committee suggested that the Secretariat reach out to other hosting platforms and hosted entities to compare rates for a future possible discussion with UNOPS.

Next, the Secretariat presented the updated Risk Management Framework and the top five risks as well as suggested mitigation actions. In the RMF, likelihood and impact combination were used to classify the severity of each risk. The five highest corporate risks were rated based on their importance for 2016.

The highest risk *“Failure to plan and provide for financial sustainability of the partnership”* is linked to several causes already raised, e.g. separation between membership fees and financial sustainability, increased earmarking, withdrawal of certain donors, etc. The 2<sup>nd</sup> highest risk, *“Inability to fully spend and deliver on significant earmarked contributions by major donors before the end of the funding cycle”*, was raised with very short timeframe and high conditionality. The Committee noted that some members were concerned about the 18-month project schedule. The Committee proposed to develop a screening process of new projects to determine the criteria for a “go” and a “no-go” for each project (ability to spend, alignment with the MTS, synergies with existing portfolio, etc.) to be incorporated into the RMF. The 3<sup>rd</sup> highest risk, *“Low quality production and ineffective dissemination of technical assistance/research materials and products”*, is due to the low quality of materials, ineffective dissemination, and poor attribution to Cities Alliance. The 4<sup>th</sup> highest risk, *“Inability to effectively service the Membership”*, is linked

to the question of how to adequately service very different members. Recently, the function of a member focal point was delegated from the Cities Alliance Director to a dedicated Cities Alliance staff member, and the Secretariat reached out for external expertise (The Partnering Initiative). The 5<sup>th</sup> highest risk, *“Inability to accept/adapt to changes in financing mechanism/requirements by donors”*, is external and linked to the increase of earmarked funding impacting the delivery and overall organisational coherence.

Members highly appreciated the report and complimented the work undertaken by the Secretariat. It was underlined that the Management Board would like to be constantly updated on the top five to 10 risks. It was noted that not enough attention has been paid to the capacity of attracting and retaining staff as well as growing global security risks. It was also noted that mitigation measures should be incorporated into contribution agreements and contracts issued by the Cities Alliance. Members also suggested to further develop the Results Framework to tackle the long term financial sustainability issue.

Next, the Chair touched upon the draft ToR for the Cities Alliance Audit. As part of UNOPS, Cities Alliance has a peculiar nature and the auditing modalities have to be carefully selected. Following the minor changes requested by the Committee on 5 October 2015, the Committee recommended the TOR for Board approval. The Interim Management Board approved the ToR for the Cities Alliance Audit.

**DECISION**

- 4. The draft Risk Management Framework was approved. The Secretariat will incorporate the recommendations of the Management Board.**
- 5. The ToR for the Cities Alliance Audit was approved.**



## **b. Membership Standing Committee Report**

The Membership Standing Committee met on 16 February 2016. Brazil joined via teleconference and asked for Clare Short to Chair to ensure a smooth meeting. . The following members were in attendance: Junia Santa Rosa (Brazil, Chair); Alioune Badiane (UN-Habitat); Clare Short (Sr. Policy Advisor); Jean-Pierre Elong Mbassi (Chair, Cities Alliance Interim Management Board) and Mikael Atterhög (Sida). SDI submitted written comments.

The Committee adopted the minutes of the previous meeting (5 October 2015), reviewed and recommended three applications for membership, deliberated on the draft Membership Guide and the Membership Planning Tool, and discussed the preparations for the upcoming Assembly meeting in April. Clare Short reported on the key recommendations discussed at the meeting<sup>2</sup>.

The Committee debated over the question of setting two fees for the membership category of National Governments – one fee for developed bi-lateral national aid agencies (\$250,000/year) and a second fee for Developing Country Governments (\$50,000/year) using the OECD DAC list as definition for LDC, other Lower Income and Lower Middle Income countries. The Secretariat was requested to make a further recommendation around which countries should pay which fee. Discussing the fees prompted a discussion around the Membership of Country Programme Governments, and it was recommended to offer them Associate Membership during the term of the Country Programme. A clarification was requested regarding Associate Members sponsoring applications to the Catalytic Fund, and the Committee recommendation was that both Associate Members and regional/local affiliates of the Members (i.e. SDI and HFHI) have the right to sponsor applications to the Catalytic Fund, but in concert with a Full Member.

Three new applications for membership were reviewed, and the Committee recommended New York University's Marron Institute and Ford Foundation for Full Membership and UNISDR for Associate Membership. Simultaneously three verbal updates for prospective members were presented. IADB will request Associate Membership, pending a meeting of the Senior

---

<sup>2</sup> *Draft Minutes of the Membership Committee Meeting are attached in Annex IV.*

Management Committee on 18 February 2016. It was recommended to finalise their membership virtually. Arup International Development and the African Development Bank (AfDB) have also expressed interest in joining. The Secretariat will send them a follow-up letter to the AfDB to keep them updated on the status of Cities Alliance. Members requested that the Secretariat facilitate the three sponsors for each new prospective member, but that prospective members take the requirement seriously and reach out to current Full Members to discuss potential membership and sponsorship. Members expressed interest in more engagement with the private sector; however, the Cities Alliance needs to reflect on the appropriate ways to avoid conflict of interest, financial conflicts, procurement conflicts, and other sensitive issues. Sida and HFHI proposed sharing their procedural guides which can serve as inspiration for reflections. It was recommended that the Secretariat prepare a short engagement paper for the next meeting.

The Chair reported that both the Membership Guide and the Membership Planning Tool will be updated to reflect the discussions and published accordingly.

The Committee also deliberated on preparations for the Assembly meeting. Members requested updating the Assembly Agenda to distribute the governance discussion over two days, and an alternative agenda was tabled at the meeting for consideration. The Secretariat also tabled a recommendation on seat allocation across constituencies to facilitate the (s)election process of the new Board. The proposed formula is as follows:

- *Constituencies with 1-3 Members obtain 1 seat;*
- *Constituencies with 4-7 Members obtain 2 seats;*
- *Constituencies with 7+ Members obtain 3 seats.*

With the current Membership the formula results in a 10-Member Board:

- **National Governments: 3**
- **Multilateral Organisations: 1**
- **Local Governments: 2**
- **Civil Society/NGOs: 2**
- **Private Sector/Foundations: 1**
- **Universities: 1**

It was further proposed to (s)elect two members at large to complete the Board, making it a 12-

Member Board plus the Chairperson.<sup>3</sup>

The Members had overall positive feedback to the proposal and recommended that the Secretariat develop a more detailed Recommendation Note outlining the whole process that would be presented at the last Interim Management Board meeting on 5 April 2016.

**DECISIONS**

- 6. The Board approved the Membership Guide and the Membership Planning Tool, which need to be updated slightly to incorporate recommendations of the Membership Committee and the Board.**
- 7. The Secretariat will prepare a recommendation regarding Membership Fees for National Governments.**
- 8. Membership applications from NYU and Ford Foundation were endorsed for Full Membership, and UNISDR was endorsed for Associate Membership.**
- 9. The Secretariat will prepare a Recommendation Note for the appointment process of the new Management Board.**

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Proposal for the (S)election of the Management Board 2016-2019' is attached in Annex V.

### **Item 3: Partnership Strategy**

Jenny Ekelund, Associate at the Partnering Initiative, presented the preliminary results of the partnership health check survey undertaken 1-9 February 2016. The key objectives of the survey were: to allow members time to reflect on the health of the Cities Alliance global partnership, including the efficiency of the partnership's setup, operation and processes; to identify areas of focus, discussion and improvement, and lay the groundwork for the collaborative drafting of a practical strategy to strengthen the global partnership; to help to set expectations and a framework for good practice for the partnership; and to give members the opportunity to think about Cities Alliance's future in advance of the first meeting of the Assembly. The tailored survey was confidential and circulated to all members. Each member's submission carried equal weight in the analysis and follow-up interviews were ongoing as of 17 February 2016. At the same time, Secretariat staff were also being surveyed. On the basis of this work the Partnering Initiative will draft the Cities Alliance Partnership Strategy to be presented at the Assembly meeting in April for further feedback and refining.

Overall, the response rate was very high and showed good levels of member satisfaction with the partnership. There is a clear desire to step the partnering approach up a notch with a strong ambition emerging from, and linked to, the SDGs 11 and 17. Members clearly see Cities Alliance as a platform for action for their organisations. Nevertheless, this is not always matched by the level of understanding and political will within their own organisations, and practical actions should be identified to help remedy this. There is a solid desire for the partnership strategy to be ambitious, build on existing strengths of Cities Alliance collaborations, and reinforce the bedrock principles of transparency, equity, value to all. As to the Secretariat's role, more work needs to be done to establish a common understanding; however, member preferences lean towards the Secretariat *facilitating and coordinating*, supporting members to lead and implement. Members agreed that Country Programmes and Joint Work Programmes deliver high specificity of interest for those involved and should be refined, developed, and extended to other members.

The Members Wish list was summarised as follows:

- Ambition to become the go-to platform for donors interested in the New Urban Agenda and SDG 11;
- More proactive member initiatives;
- Wider, ever more diverse membership;
- More regional knowledge exchange opportunities allowing in-depth discussion;
- The development of platforms around different topics for interested parties to coalesce;
- Potential development of an intranet or online facility to enable closer collaboration and identification of overlapping interest areas; and
- Appetite to work more with the private sector coupled with uncertainty over how best to engage.

The future of the organisation was scrutinised at length, and the results of the SWOT analysis presented in the table below:



Members agreed that the partnership should focus on four key areas:

1. Strengthening the Cities Alliance's role as an effective global platform for partnership, facilitating innovative, collaborative projects and programmes within and external to its membership to promote poverty reduction, sustainable development, and resilience within cities;
2. Combining members' voices in a clear and representative way to facilitate strong advocacy and policy contributions at a global level;
3. Acting as an efficient, relevant, thriving knowledge and innovation exchange for members;
4. Generating and disseminating learning from Cities Alliance projects and programmes as well as from members' own activities.

The next steps to be taken in the draft Partnership Strategy are the development of a clear statement of ambition incorporating the four focus areas for partnership, jointly agreed principles for working together (Protocol for Engagement), and a practical action plan to maximise the value of working in partnership.

The Members congratulated the Partnering Initiative for an excellent job and underlined that the very process of reflection will strengthen the alliance and its ability to collaborate more effectively. A brief Q&A session followed the presentation; the main questions from Members related to any signs of fatigue or sickness, competition for resources in a growing organisation, implications of the great ambition of being a platform for SDG 11, and regional implementation processes. The conclusions that can be drawn from the survey's initial results do not reveal any signs of serious disagreements. The main challenge is to maximise efforts by capitalising on the existing capacity as well as clarifying the ambitious goals.

## **Item 4: Preparations for Cities Alliance Assembly Meeting**

The preparations for the inaugural meeting of the Cities Alliance Assembly on 6-7 April are in process. The Secretariat circulated a Concept Note for the Cities Alliance Assembly, two versions of a draft agenda, Rules of Procedures for the Management Board, as well as detailed TORs for the Board Chairperson, the Assembly Chairperson, and the Senior Policy Advisers for discussion and approval.

The Concept Note for the Cities Alliance Assembly and the two draft agendas were discussed. After considering the advantages and disadvantages of both agendas, the Members endorsed the original agenda. The composition of the Board raised a lengthy debate. Observations were made that within the current model it might be difficult to provide a true regional, donor and institutional representation and balance. A suggestion was made to change the structure and create a bigger board with a smaller executive committee that would meet between the board meetings to coordinate daily work. However, as this proposal implies further Charter amendments there was a consensus that it should be postponed to a later stage. In the context of fundraising for the core funds, some members also raised concerns that the existing structure and charter do not address the question of accommodating the need for a fiduciary function for members. The Secretariat reminded that it had proposed previously a category of Sustaining Members that would automatically be represented at the Board precisely for that oversight function. A proposal was made to create a separate Fiduciary Committee which could be a possible solution to satisfy the requirements of many organisations/governments. However, most Members felt that creating new sub-structures might not be the best solution and would only replicate bureaucratic structures. It was further proposed that main donors rotate between themselves, providing a permanent representation of donors on the Board. Another solution was to elevate the decisions on the budget and work plan to the Assembly. At the same time, members were concerned about the division of the organisation into first class and second class members, donors and recipients, which is not how a partnership should work. Finally, it was noted that there is still room for maneuver within the current Charter to allow a 15-member Board. It was also underlined that not all member organisations have the time and human resources to be represented on the Board, and that a compromise should be reached. The

Secretariat was tasked to draft a Recommendation Note for consideration at the next meeting. The question of the nomination process within each constituency was also discussed, and members concluded that due to asymmetries within each constituency, it would be best for each constituency to discuss the question within its group with the facilitation of the Secretariat when necessary.

Next, the Board discussed the appointment of the Chairperson of the Management Board, and the Secretariat sought guidance as to the procedures. Some members expressed the view that advertising or hiring headhunters is the most transparent procedure for such a key position; however, it would be costly. A list of names could be suggested by the Secretariat for discussion and consideration with no obligation to choose from that list, or the floor could be open to Members to nominate during the Assembly meeting. However, Members preferred to avoid last minute surprises and underlined that some pre-selection research can be very beneficial. The question of remunerating the selected Chairperson was discussed, and members concluded that if the position implies substantial work, support to the Director, fundraising and representation with dedicated working hours, it could be a paid one, otherwise only the expenses should be reimbursed. In conclusion, the Members agreed that as the outgoing Board they will recommend potential candidates to the new Board and that the Secretariat would come up with some proposals. After a brief discussion on the appointment process of the Assembly Chairperson, it was decided to task the Secretariat with drafting a detailed Recommendation Note highlighting the process and potential candidates to avoid any vagueness. As to the appointment of Senior Policy Advisors, it was recommended that the Assembly appoints two to three advisers by nominations, allowing a regional balance.

Finally, the Board reviewed the proposed Charter amendments. Particularly, the Secretariat suggested to change the language in Paragraph 22 away from ‘*Membership Fees*’ and replace it along these lines: “*All full members make an annual financial contribution to the core funds of the Cities Alliance Trust Fund. The level of these contributions will be determined by the Management Board.*” Next, the Secretariat suggested to amend Paragraph 32 adding a member of the United Nations system representative to the composition of the Board: “*The Management Board comprises a maximum of fifteen members. Each constituency will be represented, including*



*a United Nations system organisation". And finally, the last two amendments refer to the Secretariat. It was proposed to amend Paragraph 42 to include the following: "All Cities Alliance activities shall be consistent with UN and UNOPS principles, policies and procedures". Paragraph 43: "A representative of the Trustee may also participate ex-officio in meetings of the Management Board".*

All the amendments were unanimously approved and recommended to be presented to the Assembly for ratification.

**DECISIONS**

- 10. First version of the draft agenda for the inaugural meeting of the Cities Alliance Assembly was approved.**
- 11. The Interim Management Board will recommend potential candidates for the position of the Chairperson of the Management Board, and the Secretariat will come up with some proposals.**
- 12. The Secretariat will prepare a Recommendation to accommodate the specific need of "Sustaining Members".**
- 13. The Secretariat will draft a detailed Recommendation Note highlighting the process of nominations and appointment as well as potential candidates for the position of Assembly Chairperson.**
- 14. The Interim Management Board recommends that the Assembly appoint two to three Senior Policy Advisers.**
- 15. Amendments to Paragraph 22, 32, 42 and 43 of the Cities Alliance Charter were approved. The amendments will be presented to the Assembly for ratification.**

## **Item 5: MTS Updates**

Substantive updates from two Joint Work Programmes (JWPs) were circulated to the Board. In general, the JWP process is having a major impact on the workings of the Cities Alliance, and is proving to be a very effective way of engaging existing, new and potential members. The Secretariat gave verbal updates at the meeting.

### **a) JWP Equitable Economic Growth**

In line with the priority areas set out in the MTS, the Cities Alliance Partnership is in the process of establishing a JWP with a focus on fostering equitable economic growth in cities. The JWP framework is currently being developed under the chairmanship of DFID. Parallel with the development of the JWP framework, a procured company, Triple Line, is developing and piloting a diagnostic toolkit on Equitable Economic Growth in Cities in selected cities in Uganda, Mozambique, Ghana and Burkina Faso. This assignment and all its products are constantly peer-reviewed by an external sounding board as well as JWP members.

To inform and contextualise the country selection process for the JWP, a country selection document has been drafted and circulated to the members providing an indicative outline of the structure and content of the JWP, including development objectives, potential outcomes, components, governance, and implementation arrangements. The proposed country selection methodology is based on four factors: thematic relevance, global spread and outreach, strategic importance, and country commitment and readiness. Additional effort has been made to align the proposed countries to DFID's list of current partner countries, which is influencing the scope of JWP engagements in partner countries. Based on these factors, a longlist has been produced and was presented along with relevant statistical indicators. A recommended shortlist has also been composed, along with a proposed batching arrangement. The batching arrangement allows for a sequencing of in-country work, which in turn provides opportunities for both incremental improvements of the JWP tools and approaches as well as adaptation to specific country contexts.

## **Member Discussion**

Members congratulated the Secretariat team for the progress and noted that the country selection must be a very conscious choice, considering the political realities and other factors. At the same time, opinions were raised that governance issues in many countries should not automatically rule them out – effectually penalising the poor for the misbehaviour of the leadership – and that we should consider avenues of continuing our work to promote more democratic changes in the long run. It was recommended to undertake scoping missions. Based on the discussions, the Secretariat suggested switching Uganda and Ghana.

Some Members had objections to such countries as Greece, Spain, and Chile on the longlist and Greece on the shortlist. Supporting non DAC-list countries is not acceptable for many organisations. However, this could be mitigated by ensuring that the staff time working on the JWP is not charged to the Core Funds. The Secretariat explained that co-funding might be necessary for the countries outlined in batches 2 and 3, that new partners have already expressed interest in this work, and that any emerging collaborations will be clearly outlined in the future. Members inquired about the risk management framework, methods of results measurement, as well as a model to measure the contribution of cities to GDP. Such model does not exist yet despite considerable literature on the topic. The Secretariat clarified that the funding arrangement with DFID provides a tight reporting system, with outputs and deliverables to be submitted not only to the funder but also to this Board and the Director of the Secretariat.

Next, it was underlined that this particular programme is equally important for SDG 8, which promotes inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all. For the purposes of methodology, it was recommended to look at the targets and indicators that will bring an innovative approach to the JWP. The programme can potentially support several countries to achieve Goals 8 and 11 at the same time.

The document was endorsed and Uganda was retained in the first instance.

## b) JWP Habitat III

The Secretariat circulated an update of the JWP activities, and Franz Marré provided a verbal update at the meeting. Currently the JWP counts 12 members with Brazil, ICLEI and IHS joining recently. The JWP held its annual meeting in Bonn in January 2016 to identify key milestones in the Habitat III preparation process and venues for joint activities, such as a meeting in New York in Q1/2016, to discuss issues such as the first draft of the outcome document. The meeting was also attended by the co-chair of the Habitat III bureau and SDSN. It was underlined that the whole process towards the conference is lacking transparency: there are numerous activities going on, and it is unclear how they influence the final result. The role of SDSN should also be further clarified.

As next steps GIZ is developing a technical background paper that provides an evidence base for the partnership approach that was chosen as the JWP's key message. The JWP members are also working on the draft Action Plan for 2016, the operationalisation of joint advocacy activities at the European level, as well as the organisation of the next JWP meeting in New York to discuss the first draft outcome document.

Members were invited to participate at the German Habitat Forum on 1-2 June 2016, which is not a part of the official process but takes place three weeks after the zero draft will be out and six weeks before the Surabaya conference. As such it would be a very good opportunity for convening and exchanging views on the zero draft.

Finally, the Members were informed about a change in focal point that had taken place. Rene Hohmann assumed the full-time Programme Management Function of the JWP for Equitable Economic Growth and Marie-Alexandra Kurth took over the focal point function for JWP H3.

### DECISION

**16. The JWP for Equitable Economic Growth Country Selection document was endorsed, and Uganda was retained in the first instance.**

## **ANNEXES**

### **Annex I: List of Attendees**

| <b>IMB MEMBERS</b>    | <b>PARTICIPANT</b>              | <b>AFFILIATION</b>                    |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Chairperson</i>    | <i>Jean Pierre Elong Mbassi</i> | -                                     |
| Senior Policy Advisor | Clare Short                     | Cities Alliance Senior Policy Advisor |
| BRAZIL                | Ines Magalhães                  | Ministry of Cities                    |
| GERMANY               | Franz Marré                     | BMZ                                   |
| GERMANY               | Astrid Meyer                    | BMZ                                   |
| GERMANY               | Günter Meinert                  | GIZ                                   |
| GERMANY               | Anka Derichs                    | GIZ                                   |
| HFHI                  | Steve Weir                      | Habitat for Humanity International    |
| SIDA                  | Mikael Atterhög                 | SIDA                                  |
| UN-HABITAT            | Alioune Badiane                 | UN-Habitat                            |
| UN-HABITAT            | Raf Tuts                        | UN-Habitat                            |
| UK                    | Melinda Bohannon                | DFID                                  |
| Guest                 | Jenny Ekelund                   | Partnering Initiative                 |
| Secretariat           | Ana Claudia Rossbach            | LAC Regional Advisor                  |
| Secretariat           | Nune Karakhanyan                | Executive Associate                   |
| Secretariat           | Phyllis Kibui                   | Head, Finance and Operations          |
| Secretariat           | Susanna Henderson               | Partnership Officer                   |
| Secretariat           | William Cobbett                 | Director                              |

**Annex II: IV IMB Meeting Agenda**

**IV Interim Management Board Meeting  
17 February 2016  
AGENDA**

*16 February: Dinner at "Volle Gas", 21 Place Fernand Cocq, 1050 Brussels*

| Venue: Rue Royale 94, 1000 Brussels |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 09:00<br>–<br>09:30                 | <b>1. <u>Opening and welcome</u></b><br><br>a) Adoption of meeting Agenda<br>b) Approval of 3rd IMB Meeting Report<br>c) Director's Report                | <b>Handouts:</b><br><br>-Agenda;<br>-IMB Meeting Report 6 Oct. 2015;<br>-Director's Report  |
| 09:30<br>–<br>10:30                 | <b>2. <u>Report from Standing Committees</u></b><br><br>a) Finance Committee Report<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>b) Membership Committee Report | <b>Handouts:</b><br><br>-Draft Finance Committee Meeting Agenda;<br>-ToR Cities Alliance Audit;<br>-Risk Management Framework;<br>-2016 Budget;<br>-2016 Work Plan<br><br>-Draft Membership Committee Meeting Agenda;<br>-Draft MC Participant List;<br>-5Oct15 MC Meeting Minutes;<br>-Draft Membership Guide;<br>-New Applications for Membership;<br>a) NYU Marron Institute;<br>b) UNISDR;<br>c) Ford Foundation;<br>d) IADB (TBC)<br>Possibly to table ARUP<br>-Membership Planning Tool |

|                              |  |   |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>10:30 –<br/>10:45</b>     | <b>Coffee Break</b>  |   |
| <b>10:45<br/>–<br/>11:45</b> | <b>3. <u>Partnership Strategy</u></b><br><br>Presentation by TPI, Jenny Ekelund  | <b>Handouts:</b><br><i>A report will be circulated after the meeting.</i>   |
| <b>11:45<br/>–<br/>13:30</b> | <b>4. <u>Preparation for Cities Alliance Assembly Meeting</u></b><br><br>a) Adoption of Concept Note on Cities Alliance Assembly<br>b) Outline of Assembly Meeting 5-7 April<br>c) Appointment of Management Board<br>d) Appointment of MB Chairperson<br>e) Selection of Assembly Chairperson<br>f) Appointment of Senior Policy Advisors<br>g) Possible changes to the Charter | <b>Handouts:</b><br>-Concept Note Cities Alliance Assembly;<br>-Draft Agenda;<br>-ROP Management Board;<br>-TOR Management Board Chairperson;<br>-TOR Assembly Chairperson;<br>-TOR Sr. Policy Advisers |
| <b>13:30 –<br/>14:30</b>     | <b>Lunch</b>   |   |
| <b>14:30<br/>–<br/>15:30</b> | <b>5. <u>MTS Updates</u></b><br><br>a) JWP Equitable Economic Growth<br>b) SDGs and JWP Habitat III  | <b>Handouts:</b><br>- <i>JWP EEG Update;</i><br>- <i>JWP HIII Update</i>  |
| <b>15:30<br/>–<br/>15:45</b> | <b>Coffee Break</b>  |   |
| <b>15:45<br/>–<br/>16:00</b> | <b>Summary of Recommendations and Closing Remarks</b>  |   |
| <b>16:00 -<br/>16:30</b>     | <b>Executive Session with the Director</b>   |   |

## **Annex III: DRAFT Finance Standing Committee Meeting Minutes**

### **Finance Standing Committee Meeting**

**16 February 2016**

**Members:** Steve Weir (HFHI, Chair); Mikael Atterhög (Sida); Clare Short (Senior Policy Advisor); Jean-Pierre Elong Mbassi (Chair, Cities Alliance Interim Management Board)

**Secretariat:** William Cobbett; Phyllis Kibui; Federico Silva; Magdalena Balocova

### **Agenda Items**

- Item 1: Adoption of Meeting Agenda
- Item 2: Approval of:
  - a. Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> Finance Committee Meeting on 5 October 2015
  - b. Minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> Finance Committee Meeting (Conference Call) on 16 December 2015
- Item 3: Presentation of Financial Update:
  - a. Summary of Funds Available for Programming
  - b. Summary of UNOPS Management Fee and Direct Allocable Costs
  - c. Budgets as approved by no-objection by the IMB on 1 January 2016
- Item 4: Presentation and Review of updated Cities Alliance Risk Management Framework
- Item 5: Presentation and Review of updated Terms of Reference for Cities Alliance Programme Audit
- Item 6: AOB
- Summary of Recommendations and Closing Remarks

### **Meeting Minutes**

#### **1. Adoption of Meeting Agenda of 4<sup>th</sup> Finance Committee Meeting**

- a. The Meeting Agenda was adopted.



## **2. Approval of Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Finance Committee Meetings**

- a. The minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> Finance Committee Meeting on 5 October 2015 were approved.
- b. The minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> Finance Committee Meeting on 16 December 2015 were approved.
- c. Future meeting minutes will include a list of follow-up actions.
- d. The Secretariat will draft an Action Plan for monitoring the follow-up actions after every meeting and will submit it to the Committee before the next meeting in April 2016.

## **3. Presentation of Financial Update**

### **a. Summary of Funds Available for Programming**

The Secretariat presented the Summary of Funds Available for Programming.

It was noted that in January 2016 UNOPS transitioned to a new Enterprise/Resource/Planning (ERP) system, called oneUNOPS, from the system owned by UNDP (ATLAS). While no material changes are expected, the final actuals for 2015 and the certified financial statements will only be available in April 2016.

**Budgeted Forecast.** The Summary of Funds Available for Programming is a forecast, not an accounting report, and it was updated as of 31 December 2015 based on reports generated in January 2016. This explains the slight differences between the total receipts in the Summary and the Forecast prepared early December 2015.

In response to the Finance Committee's previous comments, the Summary of Funds Available for Programming included budgeted revenue and expenditures. The details of the budgeted expenditures can be found in FY2016 budgets approved by no-objection by the IMB on 1 January 2016.

The Committee noted that the total contributions/income for 2015 was US\$4.8M and the total expenditures was US\$8.2M. In 2016, while the total contributions/income forecast is US\$3.9M (US\$900k less than in 2015), the total expenditures is US\$8.7M (US\$500k more than in 2016). The deficit for 2015 was US\$3.2M against expected deficit of US\$4.7M in 2016. The FY2016 expenses will deplete the reserve unless changes are made throughout the year. The total funds carried forward to FY2017 will be less than US\$300k.

**FY2016 Revenue.** The Cities Alliance Director noted that 2016 could be the turning point with the Assembly meeting in April 2016 and an assertive fundraising strategy to follow. The Ford Foundation becomes full member, after a two-year associate membership, and will start to contribute to the core funds. The Cities Alliance is increasingly successful at raising non-core restricted funds around thematic areas such as climate change. After April 2016, the Cities Alliance will become the global partnership with very influential members (IADB, UNDP etc.). The global development agenda had changed in Cities Alliance's favour, and if some internal processes are adapted, the fundraising will follow, putting the Cities Alliance in a very strong position.

**FY2016 Expenses.** The Committee asked what percentage of staff salary was charged to unrestricted, temporary restricted and restricted funds, and whether there was an opportunity to charge staff costs to non-core funds to ensure some balance.

Within the FCA project and the BMFG Intermediation, the staff costs were charged adequately and the project from Comic Relief will include staff charges as well. It was noted however that this is a new practice for Cities Alliance. The nature of funding had changed, the restricted funds received in the past were less restricted than funds received today. It is increasingly important that any donor coming with restricted funding understands the overall cost allocations and need for full cost recovery. The rule should be that the core funds do not subsidise the restricted funds. For any new restricted funding, the budget needs to include staff and overhead costs from the beginning of the project.

The Committee noted that Cities Alliance was depleting the reserve quickly and an action plan for reallocating some expenses was required to slow down the burn rate.

**Action.** The Committee recommended that "fund accounting" procedures be adopted to track and reallocate the costs between the core and non-core funds to provide the necessary back-up reserves. Two scenarios should be prepared, one conservative and one optimistic. The Committee agreed that it was important to thoroughly review the 2016 mid-year financials and take appropriate actions.

The Secretariat will prepare a proposal of different ways of allocating costs (especially staff costs) for the Committee's review. The Chair offered an offline discussion and guidance to the

Secretariat on ways to calculate overhead percentage for cost allocation purposes.

The Committee requested that the full FY2016 budget be analysed and reviewed at the next meeting. While some projects are correctly charged (FCA and BMGF Foundation), it is not a consistent institutionalised practice at the moment.

**Financial Reporting.** When setting the date of 1<sup>st</sup> Finance Committee meeting after the Assembly in April 2016, it would be useful to take into consideration of the Q1 and Q2 2016 financial closure. This will be the decision of the Board. For the Finance Committee meeting in April 2016, the financials for FY2015 and Q1 2016 should be available.

**Action.** The Committee asked what message will be given to the Assembly, and recommended moving some of the unrestricted charges to the temporary restricted and/or restricted funds prior to this meeting.

The Committee agreed that the updated Budget and Forecast Summary will be shared with the Board in April 2016 for FY2015 and Q1 2016. The Finance Committee mandate ends on 5 April 2016.

**Additional highlights.** The Gates LSC grant will close in October 2016 with a few high risk grants such as Burkina Faso. The Secretariat will be investigating a possibility for an extension. The Gates Intermediation will close in March 2017. The FCA will come to an end in June 2016. The Comic Relief project in Liberia is just about to start.

#### **b. Summary of UNOPS Management Fee and Direct Allocable Costs**

The Secretariat prepared an updated version of Summary of UNOPS Management Fee and Direct Allocable Costs. The initial agreement with UNOPS was that any expenditure except for grants was charged a fee of 8% and grant disbursements a fee of 4%. While the UNOPS charges are much higher than the World Bank, the services are not comparable – Cities Alliance is receiving fewer services at a higher price.

The Cities Alliance Director noted that UNOPS provides autonomy, political neutrality and is delivery-driven. It is not clear on how integrated Cities Alliance Secretariat is within UNOPS management. UNOPS is preparing an Administrative Instruction (AI) for setting the framework on hosting arrangements. In the future, the Secretariat recommended that UNOPS sit ex-officio on the Management Board as Trustee.

**Action.** The Committee recommended that the IMB request and authorise the Secretariat to go back to UNOPS and review the current percentage charged in order to re-examine the overall fee structure. The Committee suggested that the Secretariat reach out to other hosting platforms and hosted entities to compare the rates.

**c. Budgets as approved by no-objection by the IMB on 1 January 2016**

The Budgets were shared for information, no action from the Committee was required at this point.

**4. Presentation and Review of updated Cities Alliance Risk Management Framework (RMF)**

The Secretariat presented the updated RMF. Reducing the initial 11 priority corporate risks to a five was considered a very useful exercise. In the RMF, likelihood and impact combination were used to classify the severity of each risk. The five highest corporate risks were rated based on their importance for 2016. The Secretariat has recorded 23 risks in a risk log. Although they are not tracked regularly, it is useful to keep the complete risk log/register as a matter of record.

**4.1 The highest risk “*Failure to plan and provide for financial sustainability of the partnership*”**

is linked to several causes already raised, e.g. separation between membership fee and financial sustainability, increased earmarking, withdrawal of certain donors, cost recovery including for overhead, etc.

The Committee raised the concern that if the risk was between 65% to 90% likely to happen, the proposed mitigation measures were not sufficient.

The Cities Alliance Director noted that while it was an existential threat, it was not likely to happen and it would be wise to reconsider the message sent to the new members. However, the likelihood classification was maintained.

**Action.** The Committee suggested that the Secretariat to add the scenario planning as part of the mitigation actions for each risk to be presented to the Board in April 2016.

**4.2 The 2<sup>nd</sup> highest risk “*Inability to fully spend and deliver on significant earmarked contributions by major/visible/influential donors before the end of the funding cycle*”**

The example of FCA (US\$8M in 18 months) was raised with very short timeframe and high

conditionality. The Committee noted that some members were concerned about the 18-month project schedule. At the time, Cities Alliance needed funds and a reputational boost but it is important to learn from this experience and re-consider this type of projects in the future.

The Cities Alliance has a matrix used to screen Country Programmes to determine the countries. Such matrix could also be developed to other projects/programmes.

The delivery model is also important to consider. Under LSC, Cities Alliance would delegate the leadership on delivery in each country, while the FCA model is more “hands-on” implementation. The mitigation measures for this risk seem adequate.

**Action.** The Committee proposed to develop a screening process of new projects to determine the criteria for a “go” and a “no-go” for each project (ability to spend, alignment with the MTS, synergies with existing portfolio, etc.) to be incorporated into the RMF. The system would allow the Secretariat to ask the Board for inputs when strategic exceptions are recommended to otherwise “no-go” projects. This is also a mitigation for the 5<sup>th</sup> highest risk.

#### **4.3 The 3<sup>rd</sup> highest risk “*Low quality production and ineffective dissemination of technical assistance/research materials and products*”**

The risk is due to the low quality of materials, ineffective dissemination and poor attribution to Cities Alliance.

**Action.** The Committee noted that the quality of products and the effective dissemination and attributions seem to be two different risks of operational and reputational risk category with impact on fundraising. Knowledge materials should be listed. The likelihood of low quality should be rated as 3.

#### **4.4 The 4<sup>th</sup> highest risk “*Inability to effectively service the Membership*”**

The risk is linked to the question on how to adequately service Cities Alliance’s diverse members. Recently, the function of a member focal point was delegated from the Cities Alliance Director to a dedicated Cities Alliance personnel and in addition, the Secretariat reached out for external expertise (The Partnering Initiative).

**Action.** The Committee noted that the risk should be redefined as inability to satisfy each member’s expectations, and a clear definition of what it means to service/serve the members should be developed.

**4.5 The 5<sup>th</sup> highest risk *“Inability to accept/adapt to changes in financing mechanism/requirements by donors”***

This risk is external and linked to the increase of earmarked funding impacting the delivery and overall organisational coherence. It is also linked to the “go” / “no-go” matrix and the process of consulting the Board.

**Action.** The Committee noted that the impact should be rated as 4 considering the lack of funding.

Following the above discussion on the top five risks, the Secretariat briefly presented the rest of the risks in the complete risk log/register.

In conclusion, the Committee agreed that the top five risks were chosen wisely. Some minor adjustments to scoring and definitions should be done as outlined above.

**5. Presentation and Review of updated Terms of Reference (TOR) for Cities Alliance Programme Audit**

Following the minor changes requested by the Committee on 5 October 2015, the Committee endorsed the TOR for Board approval.

**6.** The meeting was adjourned with thanks to the Secretariat for the meeting preparation and well prepared documentation.

**List of follow-up actions**

1. The Secretariat will prepare and submit to the Committee an Action Plan for monitoring the follow-up actions on the recommendations of the Committee.
2. The Secretariat will prepare and submit to the Committee “fund accounting” procedures to track and reallocate costs between core and non-core funds, including one conservative and one optimistic scenario.
3. The Q1 FY2016 Budget vs. Actuals will be presented in the next Committee meeting in April 2016.
4. The identified costs under unrestricted funds will be charged against the temporary restricted and/or restricted funds.

5. The Committee will recommend the IMB to authorise and request the Secretariat to review the fee and direct allocable costs charged by UNOPS in order to re-examine the overall fee structure. The Secretariat will compare notes with other hosting platforms and hosted entities.
6. The Secretariat will develop a screening process of new projects to determine the criteria for a “go” and a “no-go” project which will be incorporated into the RMF.
7. The Secretariat will add scenario planning with proposed mitigation actions for top five corporate risks to be presented to the Assembly in April 2016 and make additional changes to the RMF as outlined in the *Section 4. Presentation and Review of updated Cities Alliance Risk Management Framework*.

## **Annex IV: DRAFT Membership Standing Committee Meeting Minutes**

### **Membership Standing Committee Meeting**

#### **Meeting Recommendations for the Interim Management Board**

**16 February 2016**

**Members:** Junia Santa Rosa (Brazil) (Chair); Alioune Badiane (UN-Habitat);

Clare Short (Sr. Policy Advisor) (Acting Chair at the request of Brazil); Jean-Pierre Elong Mbassi (Chair, Cities Alliance Interim Management Board); Mikael Atterhog

**Secretariat:** William Cobbett; Phyllis Kibui; Sid Henderson; Priscilla Ofori-Amanfo; Anaclaudia Rossbach, Gabriella Violim Mercurio

**Regrets:** SDI

#### **Agenda Items (ANNEX I)**

**Item 1: Opening and Welcome**

**Item 2: Review of Standing Committee Minutes, 15 October 2015**

**Item 3: Membership Guide Update**

**Item 4: Presentation of Proposals for Membership**

**Item 5: Review of Membership Planning Tool**

**Item 6: Preparation for the Assembly Meeting**

**AOB**

#### **Meeting Outcomes/Recommendations**

Recommendations to the Interim Management Board:

##### **1. Meeting Agenda**

- a. Clare Short was acting Chair at the request of Brazil
- b. SDI submitted written comments (**see Annex II**)

##### **2. Meeting Minutes from 15 October 2015**

- a. The 15 October 2015 minutes were cleared

##### **3. Draft Membership Guide**

- a. **Membership Fee Discussion**



- i. At the previous Membership Standing Committee and the Interim Management Board meeting in October 2015, a discussion was held around setting two fees for the membership Category National Governments – one fee for developed, bi-lateral national aid agencies (\$250,000/year) and a second fee for Developing Country Governments (\$50,000/year).
    1. **National Government Fees:** set two fees and use the OECD DAC list as definition
      - a. LDC, Other Lower Income and Lower Middle Income: US \$50,000
      - b. Upper Middle Income Countries: US \$250,000
    2. The Secretariat will make a further recommendation around which countries should pay which fee
  - ii. Discussing the fees prompted a discussion around the Membership of Country Programme Governments
    1. **Offer them Associate Membership** during the term of the Country Programme
  - iii. **Membership Guide** - Section 1.4 of the Membership Guide – Cities Alliance Business Lines – requested to add in Regional Strategies
- b. Catalytic Fund**
- i. Clarification from previously circulated guide accepted –
    1. **Recommendation/Confirmation:** The Catalytic Fund is not meant for Cities Alliance Members, Full or Associate; the spirit behind it is for members to support and encourage innovation on the ground via Cities Alliance
- c. Associate Members and Grant Sponsorship**
1. **Recommendation:**
    - a. Associate Membership should be welcoming; they should not be able to sponsor a grant on their own, but it is recommended that they be able to sponsor a grant with a Full Member
- 4. Presentation of Proposals for Membership**
- a. **Three formally tabled:**
    - i. **New York University – Marron Institute**
      1. Recommended for Full Membership
      2. Supported by UN-Habitat, Sida and the Secretariat will confirm if the Government of Ethiopia would like to sponsor
    - ii. **Ford Foundation**
      1. **Recommended for Full Membership – a conversion from Associate Membership to Full Membership**

**iii. UNISDR -**

- 1. Recommended for Associate Membership**
2. Supported by Sida

**b. Three verbal updates for prospective members:**

**i. IADB**

1. Will request Associate Membership, pending a meeting of the Senior Management Committee on 18 February 2016
2. Supported by Brazil, Chile and HFHI
3. Recommended to finalise their membership virtually

**ii. Arup International Development**

1. Brazil has had some good discussions of cooperation with ARUP – links with the Ministry of Cities on the topics of housing projects, slum upgrading, sanitation.

**iii. African Development Bank**

1. The Secretariat will send them a follow-up letter to keep them updated on the status of Cities Alliance

**c. Discussion around Prospective Members**

- i. Members requested that the Secretariat facilitate the three sponsors for each new prospective member, but that Prospective members take the requirement seriously and reach out to current Full Members to discuss potential membership and sponsorship
- ii. Members would like to see more Private Sector Membership/engagement but the Cities Alliance needs to think about HOW to engage
  1. For some members, there will be challenges with giving funds directly to the private sector due to government regulations
    - a. Sida will share its procedural guide around this
  2. The UN has a compact with the private sector but it does not cover exchange of funds
- iii. **Recommendation** – the Secretariat to prepare a short engagement paper for the next meeting

**5. Review of Membership Planning Tool**

- a. The tool will be updated to reflect discussion around Membership and circulated to the Membership Standing Committee along with the Standing Committee Meeting minutes

**6. Preparation for Assembly Meeting**

- a. **Draft Assembly Agenda** – Members requested the Secretariat to update the Assembly Agenda so as not to leave all of the governance discussion to the last day, in case there are some hot button issues that need more time to resolve.

- i. The Secretariat will table an updated draft Assembly Agenda at the Interim Management Board meeting
  - ii. Recommended not to have a speaker at the Gala cocktail to encourage networking
- b. **Board Election process** – Members requested the Secretariat to table a recommendation on seat allocation across constituencies for the Board at the Interim Management Board; after a discussion at the Board, the Committee recommended the process be included in the SOP of the Cities Alliance
- c. **Rebranding** – After 16 years, members would like to see something glossy at the Assembly, introducing all members to each other; members would like to see outreach to the press, as well
  - i. The Secretariat is currently undertaking a rebranding exercise of Cities Alliance, including the website, but will not change the “Cities Without Slums” tagline for now.

**Membership Standing Committee Meeting  
16 February 2016  
Agenda**

| Venue: Cities Alliance Office, Philanthropy House, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor, Rue Royale 94, 1000 Brussels |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>12h30 – 14h30</b>   | <b>Lunch</b>  | <b>Cities Alliance Office</b>   |
| <b>15h00 – 17h00</b>   | <b>Item 1: Opening and Welcome</b><br><i>Clare Short acting for Ines Magalhães, Brazil Ministry of Cities (remotely)</i><br><b>For Approval of Agenda</b>             | <b>Handouts:</b> draft Agenda; draft Participant List                                 |
|  | <b>Item 2: Review of Membership Standing Committee Minutes from 5 October 2015</b><br><i>Clare Short, Sr. Policy Advisor</i><br><b>For Review and Confirmation</b>    | <b>Handout:</b><br>5 October 2015 Membership Standing Committee Meeting Minutes FINAL |
|  | <b>Item 3: Membership Guide Updates</b><br><i>Membership Fees and Catalytic Fund</i><br><i>William Cobbett, Director</i><br><b>For Discussion and Recommendations</b> | <b>Handout:</b><br>Membership Guide   |
|  | <b>Item 4: Presentation of Proposals for Membership</b><br><i>William Cobbett, Director</i><br><b>For Discussion and Recommendations</b>                              | <b>Handout:</b><br>Proposals for Membership   |
|  | <b>Item 5: Membership Planning Tool Update</b><br><i>William Cobbett, Director</i><br><b>For Discussion and Recommendations</b>                                       | <b>Handout:</b><br>Membership Planning Tool   |
| <b>19h00 – 21h00</b>   | <b>Item 6: Preparation for the Assembly</b><br><i>Discussion around Constituencies</i><br><i>William Cobbett, Director</i>  | <b>Handout: tabled at meeting</b><br>Draft Assembly Meeting Agenda                    |
|  | <b>Item 7: Summary of Recommendations and Closing Remarks</b><br><i>Clare Short acting for Ines Magalhães, Brazil Ministry of Cities (remotely)</i>                   |   |
| DINNER Restaurant Volle Gas, 21 Place Fernand Cocq, 1050 Brussels                                      |   |   |


**SDI Comments**






Tue 16/02/2016 09:31

Nico Keijzer <nico@in2formal.org>

RE: Draft Agendas

To  Susanna Henderson

Cc  Skye Dobson;  William Cobbett

 You replied to this message on 16/02/2016 11:47.

Dear Sid, dear Billy,

Have gone through the agenda and meeting pack for this Membership Standing Committee and, honestly speaking, don't have much to contribute to the different agenda items. An email reaction does not really allow a joint reflection.

So in brief:

**Agenda Item 3: Membership Guide Updates**

Have full confidence in the recommendations coming out of your discussions.

**Agenda Item 4: Presentation of Proposals for Membership**

For all proposed new members we support a positive recommendation

**Agenda Item 5: Membership Planning Tool Update**

Agree with the proposed broad guidelines to guide the work of the Membership Committee regarding new membership.

Looking at the longlist, we see potential members from the Private Sector are virtually lacking (with the exception of ARUP). Wouldn't it make sense to make an extra effort to try and get genuine private sector organisations interested in becoming a Cities Alliance member?

Thanks and wish you a good meeting

Nico

## **Cities Alliance Membership Standing Committee**

### **Terms of Reference**

#### **A. Membership Standing Committee**

The Membership Standing Committee is a sub-committee of the Management Board established by the Cities Alliance Charter dated 7 November 2014 (paragraph 41).

The Membership Standing Committee shall consist of not less than two members of the Management Board and membership will be open to non-Management Board members. One member from the Management Board will be nominated as the Chair of the Standing Committee by the Management Board. The Partnership Officer of the Cities Alliance Secretariat shall act as Secretary to the Standing Committee.

#### **Appointment of Members of the Standing Committee**

The Management Board shall at their first meeting following the Annual Meeting determine the members of the Standing Committee, whose mandate will be consistent with the mandate of the Board. Should a vacancy arise, the Management Board will fill the vacancy from amongst its members.

#### **Frequency of Meetings**

The Standing Committee shall meet as often as necessary, but not less than three times per year. Meetings may be real and/or virtual. A quorum at each meeting shall be two members plus the Secretariat. In the absence of the formal Chair, an ordinary member may act as Chair for that meeting.

#### **Records of Meetings**

The Standing Committee will ensure that the proceedings and recommendations are recorded, and forwarded to the Management Board. A staff member from the Secretariat shall prepare minutes for review and approval by the Chair.

#### **Staff Attendance**

The Director, shall normally be required to attend all meetings of the Standing Committee. Other staff may

attend meetings as required, by agreement between the Chair and the Director.

### **Functions of the Sub-Committee**

- Review the draft Membership Strategy of the Cities Alliance, including criteria, levels of contributions and procedures;
- Identify and help recruit new Members for the Cities Alliance;
- Interact with individual Members on any Membership issues;
- Work with the Director to develop and implement programmes for enhancing membership satisfaction
- Consider reports from the Director on Membership requests;
- Make recommendations to the Management Board on all membership matters.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Chair of the Committee**

#### **Appointment of the Standing Committee Chair**

The Chair of the Membership Committee shall be a member of the Management and nominated by the Management Board as Chair for the duration of the Committee's mandate.

The Chair of the Standing Committee will be responsible for

- Approving the Agenda of each meeting;
- Chairing each Committee meeting;
- Approving the draft minutes of each meeting;
- Working with the Director, as necessary; and
- Submitting Committee reports to the Management Board

## **Annex V: Proposal for the (S)election of the Management Board 2016-2019**

*CA Secretariat Draft: 17 February 2016*

**Cities Alliance Assembly 6/7 April.**

### **Proposal for the (s)election of the Management Board 2016-2019**

**1. Charter: Relevant clauses:**

- i. 31 – The Assembly appoints the Management Board. The Management Board is accountable to the Assembly;
- ii. 32 – The Management Board comprises a maximum of fifteen members. Each constituency will be represented. The overall allocation and balance of the Board is by decision of the Assembly; and
- iii. 15: Membership of the Cities Alliance is open to representatives from the following Constituencies, which will be represented in the Cities Alliance Assembly:
  1. National Governments
  2. Multilateral etc
  3. Associations of Local Governments;
  4. Civil Society and non-Governmental organisations;
  5. Private Sector and Foundations; and
  6. Universities etc.

The Secretariat proposes that the Assembly allocate seats according to the following formula:

1-3 Members: 1 seat

4-7 Members: 2 seats; and

7+ Members: 3 seats

This would produce a 10-Member Board, *viz.*,

**National Governments: 3**

**Multilateral: 1**

**Local Governments: 2**

**Civil Society / NGO: 2**

**Private Sector / Foundations: 1**

Universities etc: 1

It is further proposed to (s)elect two members at large, making a **12-Member Board**, plus Chair.

***For Consideration***