

**From:** SHORT, Clare [mailto:SHORTC@parliament.uk]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2009 12:15 PM  
**To:** Baehring Annette GTZ 4223  
**Subject:** RE: Temporary Working Group Cities Alliance , Second Draft of Report

Dear Annette

**Second draft on report of working group on the governance and structure of the Cities Alliance**

I am writing to say that I cannot support this report or the approach that has been taken to the complaints raised by Sweden and Norway.

My view is that the complaints seem to arise as a result of a communication problem that needs to be resolved by mediation and a commitment to improved communications. The way in which the working group has been managed has made heavy weather of the complaints and the proposals imply excessive bureaucratic and other burdens that will not assist Cities Alliance to work more effectively.

My specific responses are as follows:

**Recommendation (1)**. This would involve expensive use of resources and staff time. There have been a number of recent evaluations. The recommendation does not delve into whether there is any substance in the complaint made and proposes a very expensive and long winded enquiry. I do not support this.

**Recommendation (2)** This contains no detail of the way the Public Policy Forum should change but simply calls for more time and invitees. Again, this is potentially expensive in resources and staff time and the purpose is unclear.

**Recommendation (3)** It is all very well to say more NGOs, CBOs and Private Sector should be involved, but the recommendations suggest simply adding more to the PPF and CG. I am not sure that the GC works at all well as it is and I do not support adding more participants. It is not in any way clear how this would improve the work of the Cities Alliance.

**Recommendation (4)** I am not close enough to the process to know whether this is desirable.

**Recommendation (5)** This appears to say that the Secretariat should continue with what they are doing.

**Recommendation (6)** Work is going on at present on improving monitoring and evaluation.

**Recommendation (7)** Everyone agrees that this is desirable, but it is a matter of resources.

**Recommendation (8)** This is also desirable and would be more easily done if resources were not wasted on working group meetings and resource-expensive recommendations.

**Recommendation (9)** I am completely opposed to this proposal. The majority at the Nairobi meeting were opposed. It would be an inefficient use of resources.

**Recommendation 10** All are agreed on the objective. There is no need for a bureaucratically rigid recommendation. Cities Alliance is a small catalytic organisation with a major donor.

**Recs 11, 12 and 13** These should be part of a general ongoing discussion on the role and work of Cities Alliance.

**Recommendation 14** I agree with this. It means that all previous recommendations are redundant. We need a constructive consideration of the best way forward after 10 years. This requires realism, trust and mutual respect. These values have not been reflected in the work of the working group.

As I have said to you, I have found the whole process unconstructive and badly focused.

I hope that these responses are helpful.

Best wishes

from the office of  
the Rt Hon Clare Short MP  
House of Commons  
London SW1A 0AA

Tel: 020 7219 4264  
Fax: 020 7219 2586