

# Cities Alliance

Cities Without Slums

Cities Alliance Executive Committee Meeting  
15 November 2010  
Mexico City, MEXICO  
Summary

## I. Attendance

**Executive Committee:** Messrs. Carrasco (Chile) Marré (BMZ), Bender (BMZ/GTZ), Baehring and Schuck (GTZ); Berg (Norway); Maphisa (South Africa); Gateau (Chair) and Saiz (UCLG); Smaoun(UNEP); Biau and Badiane (UN-Habitat)

**Secretariat:** Messrs. Cobbett, Henderson, Kibui, Meinert and Milroy

**Presenter:** Mr. Jamie Simpson, GHK International

**Venue:** Hilton Reforma Hotel, Mexico City, #70 Avenida Juarez

**See Annex I for Final Meeting Agenda**

## II. Morning Session: Cities Alliance Charter Discussion

**Meeting Chair:** Emilia Saiz

### **3rd Meeting – Mexico City Executive Committee Meeting, 15 November 2010**

The Executive Committee considered additional comments from Norway and Germany as well as some preliminary comments from the World Bank lawyer. Comments from Sida were received 15 November via email and were also circulated by the Secretariat and considered at the meeting. These comments were subsequently circulated to the CG as well as printed for the CG meeting 16-17 November 2010.

The Executive Committee agreed to make some slight modification to the 26 October 2010 version and requested the Secretariat to immediately circulate the updated version to the CG and print hard copies for the CG meeting 16-17 November 2010.

## III. Afternoon Session:

**Meeting Chair:** Elisabeth Gateau

### **1. GHK presented its evaluation of Project Implementation Modalities of the Cities Alliance**

- a. TOR - The evaluation of client and of non-client grant implementation for city development and slum upgrading projects in cities or at national level should provide evidence to assess the applicability and effects of [client and member] implementation modalities

- b. Outcomes included –
  - i. High transaction cost of grant administration
  - ii. Members are key to the quality during grant execution phase
  - iii. There is limited capturing and sharing of results and lessons
  - iv. Timely delivery important to realise results & catalytic effects
  - v. CA has good reputation with ability to leverage
- c. Final report due in December 2010

**2. Cost of Grant Administration – paper circulated at meeting**

- i. The Secretariat has built capacity to improve the efficiencies of the grant set-up process
- ii. There is a marked improvement from FY08-10
- iii. Approximate cost of each grant is USD25,000
- iv. Secretariat presented “Project Approval and Grant Set-up Processing Time statistical summary FY2007-2010”
  - 1. A similar analysis will be done for FY11 and presented at the next EXCO meeting
  - 2. Members should anticipate possible delays due to streamlining and tightening of grant set-up procedures within the World Bank

**3. Post Conflict Fragile States – paper circulated at meeting**

- i. World Bank had requested a quick analysis of CA’s work in Post Conflict Fragile States at the Paris EXCO in October 2010
- ii. Secretariat presented list of active, recently completed and pipeline projects that have received CA funding for countries on the Harmonized List of Fragile Situations FY11, used by the World Bank
- iii. EXCO recommends that the CA should be working in Fragile States, but not Conflict or Post-Conflict States

**4. Review of Budget and Work Programme FY10-11**

- i. CA has allocated \$16m in FY10, \$10.7million from Core Funds, of which \$9.5m are for country-specific projects
- ii. Prior to closing the Grant Facility on 31 March 2010, CA received 29 proposals, totaling \$9.3m, of which 24 passed threshold; 9 have been approved in FY10 and 15 will carry over to FY11
- iii. Heavy demand for CA grant facility during the close-down period will deplete the \$6.7m unallocated CA Core Funds carried into the start of FY10.
- iv. Core Contributions from donors totaled \$7.1million, same as the FY09 level. Investment income was down due to low yields.
- v. Actual expenditures for FY10 Secretariat costs are expected to be approximately \$0.2m less than was budgeted due to delays in hiring staff

- vi. For FY11, A \$19.15m budget to support the work programme was endorsed by the EXCO at its July 2010 meeting - \$10.15m from Core, \$8m from unallocated Gates Foundation funds, and \$1m from the Africa Facility
- vii. To fully implement the work programme, an increase of \$2.5m in Core funds is needed for FY11
  - 1. Under approved allocations, UN-Habitat requested to review all funded State of the Cities Reports to reduce duplication of effort

## **5. Forward Planning and Resource Mobilisation**

- i. As the Secretariat implements the new business model, in particular the Country Programmes, it will need help from members fundraising for the CA
- ii. The Secretariat is working on putting together products that will take on board recommendations from the GHK evaluation

## **6. Partnership Matters**

- a. Membership Issues
  - i. Secretariat seeks guidance on how to deal with a member whose behaviour is not concurrent with the CA Charter and Mandate
  - ii. EXCO requested further information to be presented at the next EXCO meeting
- b. Independent Evaluation of 2011
  - i. EXCO agreed to be involved in the selection of the Firm
  - ii. The Secretariat will re-circulate the draft Terms of Reference as well as the Guidelines for DGF Funding Evaluations
  - iii. Comments are due to the Secretariat by 23 December 2010
- c. Country Programme Selection
  - i. EXCO considered a report prepared by the Secretariat to select the fourth Land, Services and Citizenship country programme (after Uganda, Vietnam and Ghana)
  - ii. After making some additional comments on the criteria (local government), the Executive Committee unanimously selected Burkina Faso.

## **7. Farewell Speech was given by Daniel Biau, UN-Habitat (see Annex II)**

## **8. Elisabeth Gateau, UCLG and EXCO Chair, may have also chaired her last EXCO meeting**

## **9. Secretariat will prepare speaking notes for EXCO's report back to the CG for 16 November 2010**

## **10. Next EXCO Meeting will be hosted by the World Bank, to be held in Washington, DC in March 2011**



(left – right): First row: Pablo Carrasco (Chile), Franck Bousquet (WB), Martin Maphisa (South Africa), Billy Cobbett (Secretariat), Soraya Smaoun (UNEP), Alioune Badiane (UN-Habitat), Philipp Schuck (GTZ); Second row: Günter Mienert (Secretariat) , Annette Baehring (GTZ), Emilia Saiz (UCLG), Daniel Biau (UN-Habitat); Third row: Franz Marre (BMZ), Phyllis Kibui ( Secretariat), Zoubida Allaoua (World Bank); Fourth row: Carolin Bender (BMZ/GTZ), Sid Henderson (Secretariat), Erik Berg (Norway); Fifth Row: Kevin Milroy (Secretariat)

## ANNEX 1

**The Cities Alliance  
Executive Committee Meeting, 15 November 2010**

**AGENDA**

Venue: Hilton Hotel Reforma, Avenida Juarez #70, Mexico City, Mexico 06010, Tel: 52-55-5130-5300

**MONDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 2010**

<b>09h30 - 10h00</b>	<i>Coffee/Tea</i>	<i>Venue: Don Genaro Room</i>
<b>10h00 –10h30</b>	<p><b>Opening and Welcome</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Emilia Saiz, UCLG Chairperson</i></li> <li>➤ <i>William Cobbett, Manager</i></li> </ul>	
<b>10h30 – 12h30</b>	<p><b>Charter Discussion and Adoption of Draft for presentation to Consultative Group</b> <i>Executive Committee</i></p>	<i>Handouts: 26 October 2010 Charter, Matrix of Post-Paris EXCO Comments</i>
<b>12h30 - 14h00</b>	<p>***** <i>Lunch</i> *****</p>	
<b>14h00 – 15h00</b>	<p><b>Presentation: Evaluation of Project Implementation Modalities of the Cities Alliance: Findings and Signposts</b> <i>Jamie Simpson, GHK International, Director</i></p>	<i>Handouts: GHK International power point</i>
<b>15h00 - 15h30</b>	<i>Coffee/Tea Break</i>	
<b>15h30 - 16h30</b>	<p><b>Presentation: Cities Alliance Business Matters</b></p> <p><i>Kevin Milroy and Phyllis Kibui, Secretariat</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Cost of Grant Administration</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Post Conflict Fragile States</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Review of Budget and Work Programme FY10-FY11</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Forward Planning and Resource Mobilisation</i></li> </ul>	<i>Handouts: Cost of Grant Administration and Post Conflict Fragile State Note (both to be distributed at meeting); Work Programme and Financial Plan</i>
<b>16h30 - 17h00</b>	<i>Coffee/Tea Break</i>	
<b>17h00 - 18h45</b>	<p><b>Partnership Matters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Membership Issues</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Terms of Reference Independent Evaluation 2011</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Country Programme Selection Process</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Next Consultative Group Meeting</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Any other business</i></li> </ul>	<i>Handouts: Partnership Matters, CA Evaluation Briefing Note, Country Programme Selection Note</i>
<b>18h45 - 19h00</b>	<p><b>Closing Remarks</b> <i>Elisabeth Gateau, EXCO Chairperson</i></p>	

## **ANNEX II**

*The following farewell remarks were delivered by Mr. Daniel Biau, Director of UN-Habitat's Regional and Technical Cooperation Division, at the Cities Alliance Executive Committee Meeting in Mexico City 15 November 2010.*

### **Mixed but Positive Feelings...**

Dear Colleagues and friends of the EXCO,

I have worked for 30 years in international cooperation on housing and urban development. I have managed the technical cooperation division of UN-Habitat since 1994, established the network of UN-Habitat Offices around the world, initiated the World Urban Forum, the State of the World's Cities Reports, directed a number of global programmes, guided the drafting of international guidelines and of dozens of reports, co-chaired the CG during 2001-2004, etc. I joined the UN by political ideal, impressed by its mandate and the respect it gets, committed to bring my humble contribution to the noble cause of the world Peace and Development. At the time of retirement I am still proud and happy to have served the UN but I am looking backward with mixed feelings.

After joining UN-Habitat I realized quickly that the urban agenda was too broad to be an international priority. This explains why during the last decades, the United Nations system has tried to give it some focus and to link it to clearer or simpler priorities such as sustainable development, democratic governance or poverty eradication. This has not worked very well in terms of resource mobilization and overall visibility. But it has allowed better understanding of the on-going urban transition, to identify and highlight local policy options and to advise a number of governments on the best ways and means to develop and implement housing and urban strategies.

In fact the urbanization process of the developing world has been less chaotic than forecasted by the media. Many countries are managing their urban development relatively well, particularly in Asia, the Arab States and Latin America. Ideas and good practices have been shared, adapted and successfully applied in a number of emerging economies. Of course many other countries, particularly the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), are lagging behind and are unable to address the slum crisis. But the urbanization of our planet should not be seen as an outright disaster. It has both positive and negative features. The United Nations has usually stressed the negative to raise awareness while not placing enough emphasis on the positive role of cities, including their impact on rural development.

We need to address this imbalance and to adopt a comprehensive and objective point of view. I have described in various articles the major milestones of the international urban debate over the last 35 years, from the viewpoint of a UN manager and expert who has been personally involved in many stages of this journey.

We all know that the Urban Agenda covers by essence a cross-sectoral and multi-disciplinary field, and has to be related to many aspects of the economic, social, environmental, cultural and political life. It has to provide the territorial or spatial dimensions of a number of societal challenges that the UN system tries to bring together at the global level, in an often scattered but consensual manner. This might be the weakness of the urban agenda: because it is too broad it cannot stand on its own and needs to be subsumed under - or associated with - more popular and fashionable topics (such as climate change). But then it loses its explanatory power, its comprehensiveness, its political value. Therefore

urban specialists have no choice but to continue the struggle and frequently restructure this agenda in various ways to reach the world leaders.

I have followed these periodical changes in the urban discourse with some cynicism; I have even contributed to formulate that discourse. I have seen physical projects replacing institution-building in the 70s, then urban management replacing projects in the 80s, then the birth of the governance paradigm, the increasing emphasis on local authorities, the abandon of the noble cause of shelter for all and its resurrection in the anti-slum MDG 7, the death of traditional urban planning and the appearance of CDS at the turn of the century, the continuous divorce between experts advocating participatory and incremental upgrading and politicians adept of slum eradication, the recent revival of climate change and green energy concerns, the permanent and rather fruitless search for simple monitoring indicators, the gender equality credo and its subsidiary debate on mainstreaming vs. direct women empowerment, the youth bulge vs. ageing societies, and last but not least the unbelievably persistent question on how to stop (for good!) rural-to-urban migrations.

At the City Summit (Istanbul, June 1996) governments argued about urban governance concepts and later refused that UN-Habitat be called “the City Agency”. They did not understand what was underway. Now they have moved forward. They have agreed that they must decentralize powers and resources to local authorities. Many cities have adopted the City Development Strategy approach, sometimes without calling it CDS but by implementing participation and partnership principles as key ingredients of renewed urban planning. Very few have upgraded the urban slums but many, particularly in Asia, have improved the material lives of slum-dwellers by relocating them in the suburbs. Goal 7/11 has been met in only 5 years, instead of 20. Of course it was very un-ambitious but we (UN-Habitat and its Cities Alliance partners) are now goalless, orphans of the MDGs. Indeed slums remain a major problem in only two sub-regions, South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. The rest of the developing world has progressed slowly but steadily and cities are better in spite of their tremendous growth. The urban population of the developing world increased from 1.35 B in 1988 to 1.97 in 2000 and 2.6 B in 2010. However cities have been able to cope and to become effective engines of development in most regions of the planet.

My interrogation is the following: what role did we - international agencies active within UN-Habitat field of expertise and particularly CA members - play in this positive evolution? How did we help or influence the urban transition? We implemented many projects but they were mostly drops in the enormous bucket of urban initiatives. They were useful but with little quantitative impact, they did not address the magnitude of the needs.

I believe that our influence has been essentially political and ideological. Ministers came to Nairobi and to other meeting places and heard experts repeating the same messages over and over again. In their countries our local experts adapted the same messages to the specific situations. Reports, guidelines, films, websites, pamphlets, articles, informal discussions, site visits, resulted in an overall change of mindset towards housing and urban issues. Country projects were seen as demonstrations of new approaches, not as ends in themselves. They gave us the required credibility and allowed our recommendations to be taken seriously, not always followed but always kept in mind as references. We have been an implicit think tank rooted in country realities, not a research network but a “policy-making organ” as so nicely characterized by the UN jargon. I am convinced that we have played a progressive role by spreading and testing valuable ideas and concepts which were just a step ahead of standard policies and helped in due course politicians to respond better to the needs and expectations of their peoples. We have probably contributed to realize the ambitions of the UN Charter by linking and bridging “We, the peoples” and “We, the governments” in our area of work.

There is room for optimism but certainly not for complacency. Still millions of people live in abject poverty, still corruption is widespread, still wars, violence and disasters destroy human lives and settlements, still the urban environment is badly polluted, still social inequalities divide our agglomerations in ghettos, still international cooperation is under-funded... The combat for better cities and better life must therefore goes on. It will remain on my agenda.

I wish the Cities Alliance more success and thank you for listening to my soul searching.