



PORTFOLIO STATISTICAL SUMMARY

FISCAL YEARS 2000-2009

January 2010

Table of Contents

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW	7
2.1 Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects	7
2.2 Portfolio Analysis by Theme: City Development Strategies and Slum Upgrading	10
3. GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF APPROVED PROJECTS	13
4. GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF APPROVED PROJECTS	16
5. DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS BY COUNTRY INCOME GROUP	18
6. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS	19
6.1 Funding Sources	19
6.2 Allocations of Approved Grant Amount by Country Income Group	20
6.3 Approved Grant Size for Country-Specific Projects	21
7. PROJECT SPONSORSHIPS	22
8. PROJECT PARTNERS	26
8.1 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects	26
8.2 Project Implementing Partners for Country-Specific Projects	29

List of Tables and Figures

A. Tables

Table 1	Approved Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects and Grant Amount
Table 2	Net Approved Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects and Grant Amount
Table 3	Approved Country-Specific CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount
Table 4	Net Approved Country-Specific CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount
Table 5	Approved Regional/Global CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount
Table 6	Net Approved Regional/Global CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount
Table 7	List of Countries
Table 8	Project Sponsorship for Country-Specific Projects
Table 9	Number of Approved Country-Specific Projects with One or More Than One Project Sponsorship
Table 10	Project Sponsorship for Country-Specific Projects by Country Income Group

B. Figures

Figure 1	Portfolio Growth
Figure 2	Approved Grant Funding
Figure 3	CDS Proposal Approval Rate
Figure 4	SU Proposal Approval Rate
Figure 5	Geographical Distribution of Approved Projects
Figure 6	Geographical Distribution of Approved Projects in Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009
Figure 7	Geographical Scope of Approved Projects
Figure 8	Geographical Scope of Approved Projects in Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009
Figure 9	Distribution of Projects by Country Income Group
Figure 10	Ratio of Core and Non-Core Net Funding Allocations for Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects
Figure 11	Allocation of Approved Grant Amount by Income Country Group
Figure 12	Number of Grants Approved by Grant Size
Figure 13	Number of Grants Approved by Grant Size for Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009
Figure 14	Total Project Sponsorship for Country-Specific Projects

- Figure 15 Total Number of Approved Country-Specific Projects with One or More Than One Project Sponsorship
- Figure 16 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects (Number of Recipients)
- Figure 17 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects (Grant Amount)
- Figure 18 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects for Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009
- Figure 19 Member and Non-Member Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects
- Figure 20 Project Implementing Partners for Country-Specific Projects
- Figure 21 Project Implementing Partners for Country-Specific Projects for Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Over the past ten fiscal years, the project portfolio of the Cities Alliance has grown continuously by an average of about 22 new projects per year; however, there have been significant variations from year to year.
- Within the accumulated portfolio of 220 approved projects, 183 were classified as country-specific projects, covering 72 countries in six regions. Of those six regions, Sub-Saharan Africa received the largest number of approved country-specific projects (26 per cent). Just over one-third of approved country-specific projects targeted a single city; the remaining nearly two-thirds targeted the country/national level, multi cities, state, global or regional scope.
- Slightly more than half of approved country-specific projects targeted the Low Income Countries income group: Least Developed Countries (27 per cent) and Other Low Income Countries (25 per cent). Overall, however, total grant disbursements to Middle Income Countries were higher.
- Overall approved grant amounts exceeded US\$55 million for country-specific projects and US\$8 million for regional/global projects. The Cities Alliance Core Fund was by far its largest source of project funding. Large grants (over US\$250,000) were the most frequent with 37 per cent, followed by medium grants (US\$75,000 to US\$250,000) with 33 per cent and small grants (US\$75,000 or less) with 30 per cent.
- The number of proposals for City Development Strategies (CDS) was much higher than for Slum Upgrading (SU) proposals—217 for CDS compared with 117 for SU. However, the approval rate for CDS proposals was significantly lower than the approval rate for SU proposals; as a result, CDS projects ended up comprising 57 per cent of the total project portfolio.
- Nearly three-fourths of approved country-specific projects were sponsored by more than one Cities Alliance member. Twelve members sponsored more than ten projects, with The World Bank and UN-HABITAT by far the most prominent, with 134 and 77 projects, respectively.
- More projects were sponsored in Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories income group than in any other income group.
- Nearly two-thirds of all grant agreements were managed by development and international/regional organisations (development co-operations, multi- and bi-lateral organisations). The share of non-members as grant recipients has gradually increased, reaching 50 per cent in fiscal year 2009.
- There was a great variety in the types of partners involved in implementing projects.

1. INTRODUCTION

The portfolio review for fiscal years 2000 – 2009 provides a statistical summary overview of Cities Alliance funding activities over a ten-year period, focusing specifically on country-specific¹ activities and selected data from regional/global² activities. The summary should be viewed as a snapshot of portfolio trends over the last ten years³ of Alliance funding activities.

The review will present statistical summary analysis in the following areas: (1) Portfolio growth; (2) Number of projects and grant amounts approved; (3) Geographical distribution and scope of approved projects; (4) Distribution of projects by country income group; (5) Funding allocations; (6) Project sponsorships; and (7) Project partners.

In this portfolio review, the number of projects approved has been adjusted to exclude projects that were approved but cancelled during project preparation⁴ or funding activities related to programmatic allocations (see Nos. 4 and 5 below). The grant amount approved has also been adjusted to account for grant amount increases and decreases where applicable.

The following parameters were used in compiling the data analysis:

1. For projects currently **under implementation** (active projects), the total grant amount specified in the signed grant agreement was used.
2. For projects in which the grant agreements are underway or not yet initiated (under project **preparation**), information captured in the approved project proposals was used.
3. For projects that were either **cancelled during project implementation** or **closed**⁵ after being fully implemented, the actual grant amount disbursed was used.
4. Projects that were **cancelled during project preparation** were **not included** in the calculation because no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.
5. Funding related to the following activities was **not included** as they are **programmatic allocations** that would distort the overall statistical analysis in this report:
 - a. Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor
 - b. Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) activities
 - c. Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF)

The data used⁶ for the analysis was sourced from the Cities Alliance Secretariat project and proposal databases. Please note that these databases are still under development. Some definitions and

¹ These activities are primarily focused on achieving results through country-specific activities. Project proposals typically originate from local authorities, but in all cases must be approved by the government of the recipient country, be sponsored by at least one member of the Cities Alliance, and have established channels to meet investment requirements.

² These activities are designed to raise awareness, increase learning and disseminate good practices. They include establishing knowledge sharing networks and databases for city development strategies, scaling-up urban upgrading programmes, mainstreaming indicators as well as developing guidelines and other tools that advance collective know-how.

³ Fiscal years 2000 – 2009.

⁴ Projects that were cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation as the grant agreement had never been issued and no disbursements had been made.


⁵ Projects implemented and activities completed.

classifications of projects have changed over time, which may affect aggregated numbers. As the database draws on several sources, further verification is currently being undertaken, particularly for projects that are considered to have a regional/global focus.

2. PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW

2.1. COUNTRY-SPECIFIC AND REGIONAL/GLOBAL PROJECTS

The growth of the Alliance's portfolio has been gradual and consistent over the last ten fiscal years. As of the end of fiscal year 2009 (30 June 2009), a total of 220 projects—both the country-specific and regional/global project type—had been approved to receive Alliance grant funding. Out of the 220 projects, 11 projects were cancelled during project preparation, resulting in a total of 209 projects (Figure 1). Of the 209 projects, 173 were classified as country-specific projects; 36 as regional/global projects; 121 as City Development Strategy (CDS) projects; and 88 as Slum Upgrading (SU) projects⁷. These projects covered 71 countries in six regions⁸. Further detailed data on country-specific, regional/global, CDS and SU projects as well as geographical distributions of the projects will be presented in subsequent sections of this report.




⁶ Request on the data used for this report is available upon request to Cities Alliance Secretariat.

⁷ Classification of either CDS or SU projects is based on the main focus of the planned project activity. Some projects have both CDS and SU components, but were classified as either CDS or SU based on a consideration of the components.

⁸ For country-specific projects, the following regional categories were used: (1) East Asia Pacific; (2) Europe and Central Asia; (3) Latin America and the Caribbean; (4) Middle East and North Africa; (5) South Asia; and (6) Sub-Saharan Africa.

Figure 2 illustrates the total amount of approved grant funding per fiscal year for the last ten fiscal years. A comparison of approved⁹ grant funding and net¹⁰ approved grant funding shows that both types of funding remained relatively equal for fiscal years 2000 – 2009. The significant peaks in fiscal years 2001 and 2006 are due to individual slum upgrading projects in Brazil that received more than US\$5 million in funding allocations in each of those years.



The number of projects and the grant amount approved for country-specific projects and regional/global projects varied from year to year, as presented in Table 1. Table 2 depicts data on the number of funded projects¹¹ and the net grant amount approved per fiscal year. As of 30 June 2009, the data shows 11 approved projects were cancelled during project preparation, an average of one per fiscal year. Moreover, the data shows the difference between approved and net approved grant amount of US\$4,117,698 (an average of US\$471,770 per fiscal year).

⁹ Approved grant funding figures are based on approved funds (project proposal approval and grant agreement) and do not reflect the actual disbursements.

¹⁰ Net approved grant funding figures are based on the actual disbursements.

¹¹ Include projects under implementation, project canceled during project implementation and closed projects (as of 30 June 2009).

Table 1 Approved Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects and Grant Amount
Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009

Project Approval Fiscal Year	Country-Specific		Regional/Global		Total	
	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)	Total Number of Projects	Total Amount Approved (US\$)
2000	11	\$1,623,000	6	\$565,000	17	\$2,188,000
2001	23	\$10,704,800	4	\$1,348,500	27	\$12,053,300
2002	11	\$3,471,850	1	\$500,000	12	\$3,971,850
2003	16	\$3,779,753	1	\$13,195	17	\$3,792,948
2004	15	\$3,977,365	1	\$200,000	16	\$4,177,365
2005	18	\$5,236,017	7	\$2,067,544	25	\$7,303,561
2006	33	\$18,005,562	4	\$1,202,000	37	\$19,207,562
2007	17	\$2,643,625	-	-	17	\$2,643,625
2008	23	\$5,134,450	2	\$250,000	25	\$5,384,450
2009	16	\$3,945,339	11	\$2,188,020	27	\$6,133,359
Total	183	\$58,521,761	37	\$8,334,259	220	\$66,856,020

Notes:

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
- B. These calculations include projects that were cancelled during preparation or implementation.

Table 2 Net Approved Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects and Grant Amount
Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009

Project Approval Fiscal Year	Country-Specific		Regional/Global		Total	
	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)
2000	9	\$1,281,255	6	\$506,320	15	\$1,787,575
2001	23	\$10,777,670	4	\$1,344,698	27	\$12,122,368
2002	10	\$2,715,467	1	\$364,197	11	\$3,079,664
2003	15	\$3,533,306	1	\$6,063	16	\$3,539,369
2004	15	\$3,212,700	1	\$200,000	16	\$3,412,700
2005	17	\$4,410,500	6	\$2,208,354	23	\$6,618,854
2006	32	\$17,490,155	4	\$1,320,624	36	\$18,810,779
2007	16	\$2,280,663	-	-	16	\$2,280,663
2008	21	\$4,779,469	2	\$188,355	23	\$4,967,824
2009	15	\$3,870,506	11	\$2,188,020	26	\$6,058,526
Total	173	\$54,351,691	36	\$8,326,631	209	\$62,678,322

Notes:


- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
- B. For projects currently under implementation (active projects), the grant amount approved per project proposal approval or total amount specified in the grant agreement was used.
- C. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.
- D. The data in Table 2 reflects the actual disbursements for projects that were cancelled during implementation and closed projects.

2.2. PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS BY THEME: CITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND SLUM UPGRADING¹²

As of 30 June 2009, 217 proposals had been reviewed and classified as City Development Strategy (CDS) proposals. Of those 217 proposals, 126 were approved for funding for an approval rate of 58 per cent, as illustrated in Figure 3. Out of 117 proposals classified as Slum Upgrading (SU), 94 were approved for funding for a proposal approval rate of 80 per cent, as illustrated in Figure 4.

Overall, the 126 approved CDS proposals accounted for 57 per cent of the total Cities Alliance project portfolio and the 94 approved SU projects accounted for 43 per cent. The distribution of number of projects and approved grant amount (approved and net) for CDS and SU country-specific and regional/global projects are presented in Table 3, Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6.


Figure 3 CDS Proposal Approval Rate (Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009)



Notes:

Proposal data does not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) proposals with a status of 'Dormant' or 'Under Review'.

Figure 4 SU Proposal Approval Rate (Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009)



Notes:

Proposal data does not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) proposals with a status of 'Dormant' or 'Under Review'.

¹² Classification of either CDS or SU projects is based on the main focus of the planned project activities. Some projects have both CDS and SU components, but were classified as either CDS or SU based on a consideration of components.

Table 3 Approved Country-Specific CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount*Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009*

Project Approval Fiscal Year	CDS		SU		Total	
	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)
2000	9	\$1,543,000	2	\$80,000	11	\$1,623,000
2001	12	\$3,082,800	11	\$7,622,000	23	\$10,704,800
2002	6	\$2,101,785	5	\$1,370,065	11	\$3,471,850
2003	7	\$1,890,047	9	\$1,889,706	16	\$3,779,753
2004	8	\$2,047,700	7	\$1,929,665	15	\$3,977,365
2005	8	\$2,103,617	10	\$3,132,400	18	\$5,236,017
2006	20	\$6,223,532	13	\$11,782,030	33	\$18,005,562
2007	13	\$1,798,925	4	\$844,700	17	\$2,643,625
2008	12	\$2,396,475	11	\$2,737,975	23	\$5,134,450
2009	12	\$2,967,339	4	\$978,000	16	\$3,945,339
Total	107	\$26,155,220	76	\$32,366,541	183	\$58,521,761

Notes:

A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.

B. Projects cancelled during projects preparation and project implementation were included in the calculation.

Table 4 Net Approved Country-Specific CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount*Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009*

Project Approval Fiscal Year	CDS		SU		Total	
	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)
2000	8	\$1,252,284	1	\$28,971	9	\$1,281,255
2001	12	\$2,968,145	11	\$7,809,525	23	\$10,777,670
2002	6	\$1,950,053	4	\$765,414	10	\$2,715,467
2003	7	\$1,860,421	8	\$1,672,885	15	\$3,533,306
2004	8	\$1,459,954	7	\$1,752,746	15	\$3,212,700
2005	8	\$1,778,324	9	\$2,632,176	17	\$4,410,500
2006	20	\$6,198,397	12	\$11,291,758	32	\$17,490,155
2007	12	\$1,441,700	4	\$838,963	16	\$2,280,663
2008	11	\$2,196,875	10	\$2,582,594	21	\$4,779,469
2009	11	\$2,892,506	4	\$978,000	15	\$3,870,506
Total	103	\$23,998,659	70	\$30,353,032	173	\$54,351,691

Notes:

A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.

B. For projects currently under implementation (active projects), the grant amount approved per project proposal approval or total amount specified in the grant agreements was used.

C. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.

D. Data presented for projects cancelled during project implementation and closed projects reflect the actual disbursement.

Table 5 Approved Regional/Global CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount
Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009

Project Approval Fiscal Year	CDS		SU		Total	
	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Amount Approved (US\$)
2000	2	\$225,000	4	\$340,000	6	\$565,000
2001	2	\$663,500	2	\$685,000	4	\$1,348,500
2002	1	\$500,000	-	-	1	\$500,000
2003	-	-	1	\$13,195	1	\$13,195
2004	1	\$200,000	-	-	1	\$200,000
2005	5	\$1,160,944	2	\$906,600	7	\$2,067,544
2006	3	\$1,127,000	1	\$75,000	4	\$1,202,000
2008	1	\$75,000	1	\$175,000	2	\$250,000
2009	4	\$1,400,950	7	\$787,070	11	\$2,188,020
Total	19	\$5,352,394	18	\$2,981,865	37	\$8,334,259

Notes:

A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.

B. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

Table 6 Net Approved Regional/Global CDS and SU Projects and Grant Amount
Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009

Project Approval Fiscal Year	CDS		SU		Total	
	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)	Number of Projects	Net Amount Approved (US\$)
2000	2	\$193,796	4	\$312,524	6	\$506,320
2001	2	\$663,752	2	\$680,946	4	\$1,344,698
2002	1	\$364,197	-	-	1	\$364,197
2003	-	-	1	\$6,063	1	\$6,063
2004	1	\$200,000	-	-	1	\$200,000
2005	4	\$1,085,944	2	\$1,122,410	6	\$2,208,354
2006	3	\$1,260,000	1	\$60,624	4	\$1,320,624
2008	1	\$75,000	1	\$113,355	2	\$188,355
2009	4	\$1,400,950	7	\$787,070	11	\$2,188,020
Total	18	\$5,243,639	18	\$3,082,992	36	\$8,326,631

Notes:

A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.

B. For projects currently under implementation (active projects), the grant amount approved per project proposal approval or total amount specified in the grant agreements was used.

C. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.

D. Data presented for closed projects and projects cancelled during project implementation reflect the actual disbursement.

By the end of fiscal year 2009, a total of 183 country-specific projects had been approved for funding (Table 1), out of which 107 were CDS projects (with total funding of US\$26,155,220) and 76 were SU projects (with total funding of US\$32,366,541) as presented in Table 3.

The number of projects approved has been adjusted to account for projects that were cancelled during project preparation. In addition, the grant amount approved has been adjusted to reflect grant amount increases and decreases where applicable (Table 4). For CDS country-specific projects, the number of total projects funded was adjusted from 107 to 103, bringing the amount of total project funding from US\$26,155,220 to US\$23,998,659. For SU country-specific projects, the number of total projects funded was adjusted from 76 to 70 projects, bringing the total project funding from US\$32,366,541 to US\$30,353,032.

Furthermore, of the 37 regional/global projects approved for funding (Table 1), 19 projects were classified as CDS projects (with total funding of US\$5,352,394) and 18 projects were classified as SU projects (with total funding of US\$2,981,865) as presented in Table 5.

As with the CDS and SU country-specific projects, the number of projects approved for CDS and SU regional/global projects was adjusted to exclude projects that were cancelled during preparation and to account for grant amount increases and decreases where applicable (Table 6). For CDS regional/global projects, the total number of projects funded was adjusted from 19 to 18 projects, decreasing the amount of total project funding from US\$5,352,394 to US\$5,243,639. For SU regional/global projects, the number of total projects funded remained the same with 18 projects, while the total project funding amount decreased from US\$3,082,992 to US\$2,981,865 as a result of the adjustments.

3. GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF APPROVED PROJECTS

The geographical distribution of all approved projects is illustrated in Figure 5. As of 30 June 2009, the Sub-Saharan Africa region has the largest number of approved projects (26 per cent), followed by Latin America and the Caribbean (17 per cent), East Asia and the Pacific (14 per cent), South Asia (12 per cent), Middle East and North Africa (10 per cent) and Europe and Central Asia (6 per cent). Projects with a regional/global focus account for 16 per cent of the total projects approved. Table 7 features a complete list of all of the countries for which Cities Alliance projects were approved as of 30 June 2009.

The countries¹³ in each region with the largest numbers of approved country-specific projects are outlined below:

1. **Sub-Saharan Africa region.** The country with the largest number of approved projects is **South Africa**, with 11. Overall in Sub-Saharan Africa, 57 country-specific projects were approved in 24 countries.
2. **Latin America and the Caribbean region.** The country with the largest number of approved projects is **Brazil**, with 19. Overall in Latin America and the Caribbean, 37 country-specific projects were approved in 14 countries.

¹³ For country-specific projects with multiple countries, the countries were calculated separately in this review.

3. **East Asia and Pacific region.** The country with the largest number of approved projects is the *Philippines*, with 9. Overall in East Asia and the Pacific, 30 country-specific projects were approved in 10 countries.
4. **South Asia region.** The country with the largest number of approved projects is *India*, with 19. Overall in South Asia, 26 country-specific projects were approved in 6 countries.
5. **Middle East and North Africa region.** The country with the largest number of approved projects is *Egypt*, with 5. Overall in the Middle East and North Africa, 21 country-specific projects were approved in 9 countries.
6. **Europe and Central Asia region.** The country with the largest number of approved projects is the *Russian Federation*, with 3. Overall in Europe and Central Asia, 13 country-specific projects were approved in 9 countries.

Figure 5 Geographical Distribution of Approved Projects - Total of 220 projects as of 30 June 2009





Figure 6 Geographical Distribution of Approved Projects in Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009



Notes:

- A. Figures reflect both country-specific projects and regional/global projects.
- B. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
- C. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

Table 7 List of Countries Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009

Country	Number of Projects	Country	Number of Projects	Country	Number of Projects
Brazil	19	Ecuador*	2	Albania	1
India*	19	Iran	2	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1
South Africa*	11	Azerbaijan	2	Georgia	1
Philippines*	9	Bulgaria	2	Latvia	1
Mozambique	7	Nepal	2	Moldova	1
China	6	Mongolia	2	Tajikistan	1
Egypt	5	Benin	2	Bangladesh	1
Vietnam	5	Burkina Faso	2	Bhutan	1
Ethiopia*	5	Madagascar	2	Sri Lanka	1
Yemen	4	Rwanda	2	Fiji*	1
Indonesia	4	Senegal	2	Samoa*	1
Nigeria	4	Tanzania	2	Papua New Guinea*	1
Chile	3	Argentina	1	Timor-Leste (East Timor)	1
Morocco	3	Bolivia	1	Cameroon	1
Syrian Arab Republic	3	Costa Rica	1	Liberia	1
Russian Federation	3	Guatemala	1	Malawi	1
Pakistan	3	Mexico	1	Mali	1
Cambodia	3	Panama	1	Mauritania	1
Ghana	3	Haiti*	1	Namibia	1
Kenya	3	Peru	1	Niger	1
Swaziland	3	Jordan	1	Sierra Leone	1
Colombia	2	Lebanon	1	Togo	1
El Salvador	2	Palestine	1	Uganda*	1
Jamaica	2	Tunisia	1	Zambia	1

* In some cases, projects comprised multiple countries. For the purpose of this review, in those cases each country is considered separately.

Notes:

A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.

B. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

In comparison with the overall geographical distribution, Figure 6 illustrates the geographical distribution for approved projects in fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009. This chart demonstrates similar trends over these three fiscal years. The Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and Caribbean and East Asia and Pacific regions had a higher ratio of regional distributions in comparison with other regions. In addition, the Sub-Saharan Africa region led the number of approved projects in fiscal years 2007 and 2008 (26 per cent and 36 per cent, respectively), whereas in fiscal year 2009, Latin America and the Caribbean led the number of approved projects with 22 per cent.

Figure 6 also shows that no regional/global projects were approved in fiscal year 2007, whereas the number of approved regional/global projects increased significantly in fiscal year 2009 in comparison with fiscal years 2007 and 2008. The increase is partly due to the large proportion of Joint Work Programmes with Alliance members that were approved in fiscal year 2009.



4. GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF APPROVED PROJECTS

The geographical scope¹⁴ of all approved projects is shown in Figure 7. As of 30 June 2009, for approved country-specific projects, 38 per cent was targeted for one city, 25 per cent for country/national level, 18 per cent for multi cities and 2 per cent for state scopes. Furthermore, 11 per cent was targeted for global and 5% for regional scopes.

In comparison with the overall geographical scope data illustrated in Figure 7, Figure 8 illustrates that the geographical scope in fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009 shows a different data trend. The country/national level geographical scope led the project targeted area with 59 per cent, 56 per cent and 33 per cent for the respective fiscal years.

As indicated in the previous section, no regional/global projects were approved in fiscal year 2007, and as a result there is no regional or global scope for that year illustrated in Figure 8. Similarly, the significant increase in the number of approved regional/global projects in fiscal year 2009 impacted the percentage of geographic scope for that year, accounting for 30 per cent of the overall geographic scope for fiscal year 2009, as shown in Figure 8.

¹⁴ The geographical scope targeted by the approved project: (1) City; (2) Multi cities; (3) State; (4) Country/national level; (5) Regional; and (6) Global.

Figure 7 Geographical Scope of Approved Projects - Total of 220 projects as of 30 June 2009**Figure 8 Geographical Scope of Approved Projects in Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009****Notes:**


- A. Figures reflect both country-specific projects and regional-global projects.
- B. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
- C. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.
- D. Projects in metropolitan areas were considered as 'Multi Cities'.

5. DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS BY COUNTRY INCOME GROUP

The distribution of country-specific projects by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list of Official Development Assistance (ODA)¹⁵ recipients for the ten-year period is illustrated in Figure 9. Overall, the figures show that the country-specific projects by DAC list classification were distributed relatively equally among three income groups for the last ten fiscal years: (1) Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories (total of 33 per cent); (2) Least Developed Countries (total of 27 per cent); and (3) Other Low Income Countries (total of 25 per cent).

In the first three fiscal years (2000, 2001 and 2002), Other Low Income Countries had the highest percentage of group distributions. The figures changed between fiscal years 2003 to 2006, when the Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories had the highest percentage. Between fiscal years 2007 to 2009 the figures varied among the three income groups, with the exception of fiscal year 2009, when the Upper Middle Income Countries and Territories showed a significant increased in the income groups' distribution due to multiple country-specific projects approved in Brazil.

Figure 9 Distribution of Projects by Country Income Group (Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009)



Notes:

- A. Classification of Cities Alliance projects has been based on the most current list available at the time of project approval.
- B. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional/Global Projects.
- C. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.
- D. For country-specific projects with multiple countries, the countries were calculated separately in this review.

¹⁵ Classification of Cities Alliance projects has been based on the most current DAC List of Aid Recipients available at the time of project approval. The DAC List of Aid Recipients is available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/daclist>.

6. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

6.1 FUNDING SOURCES


The Cities Alliance has a two-tier financial structure: (1) Core Fund and (2) Non-Core Fund. The Core Fund is not subject to any donor restrictions whereas the Non-Core Fund is subject to any donor restrictions relating to theme, activity or region. Figure 10 illustrates the Core Fund and Non-Core Fund allocations for funded projects in fiscal years 2000 – 2009.

With the exception of fiscal years 2001 and 2006, most of the funded projects were allocated from the Core Fund. The higher percentages of Non-Core Fund allocations in fiscal years 2001 and 2006 are due to individual slum upgrading projects in Brazil that received more than US\$5 million in Non-Core Fund allocations in each of those years.

For country-specific projects, Brazil received the largest Non-Core contribution, while South Africa had the most number of projects funded from the Non-Core fund.

Figure 10 Ratio of Core and Non-Core Net Funding Allocations for Country-Specific and Regional/Global Projects

Percent of Total Allocations in US\$ per Fiscal Year




Notes:

- A. Figures reflect both country-specific projects and regional and global projects.
- B. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
- C. For projects currently under implementation (active projects), the grant amount approved per project proposal approval or total amount specified in the grant agreements was used.
- D. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.
- E. Data presented for projects cancelled during project implementation and closed projects that were fully implemented reflect the actual disbursement.

6.2 ALLOCATIONS OF APPROVED GRANT AMOUNT BY COUNTRY INCOME GROUP

The allocation of grants for country-specific projects by the DAC list classifications in fiscal years 2001 to 2009 is illustrated in Figure 11. Overall, the Upper Middle Income Countries and Territories income group received the highest grant allocation (total of 37 per cent), followed by Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories (total of 26 per cent). Other Low Income Countries (total of 17 per cent) and Least Developed Countries (total of 17 per cent) income groups shared somewhat balanced allocations, with lower grant allocations in comparison with the first two income groups.

Figure 11 Allocation of Approved Grant Amount by Country Income Groups (Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009)



Notes:

- A. Classification of Cities Alliance projects has been based on the most current list available at the time of project approval.
- B. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- C. For projects currently under implementation (active projects), the grant amount approved per project proposal approval or total amount specified in the grant agreements was used.
- D. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.
- E. Data presented for projects cancelled during project implementation and closed projects that were fully implemented reflect the actual disbursement.
- F. For country-specific projects with multiple countries, the countries were calculated separately in this review.

6.3 APPROVED GRANT SIZE FOR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS

The overall distribution of approved country-specific projects by grant size for fiscal years 2000 – 2009 is illustrated in Figure 12. The figure shows adequately balanced distributions among small (US\$75,000 or less), medium (US\$75,000 to US\$250,000) and large (over US\$250,000) grants over the past ten years.

In comparison, Figure 13 illustrates the distribution of approved country-specific projects by grant size for fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009. It indicates that for the three fiscal years combined, a larger percentage of small grant projects were funded, while the distribution of medium and large grants was fairly balanced. The data presented have been adjusted to account for grant amount increases and decreases and the grant sizes re-categorised where applicable.

Figure 12 Number of Grants Approved by Grant Size (Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009)





Figure 13 Number of Grants Approved by Grant Size (Fiscal Years 2007 – 2009)



Notes:


- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional- Global Projects.
- B. For projects currently under implementation (active projects), the grant amount approved per project proposal approval or total amount specified in the grant agreements was used.
- D. Projects cancelled during project preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreement had been issued and no disbursements made.
- D. Data presented for projects cancelled during project implementation and closed projects that were fully implemented reflect the actual

7. PROJECT SPONSORSHIPS

The total number of approved country-specific projects sponsored by Alliance members from fiscal years 2000 – 2009 is illustrated in Figure 14. The figures indicate that there are 21 members that sponsored approved projects. Of the 21 members, 12 sponsored ten or more approved projects, including UNDP as an associate member.

The number of project sponsorships by Alliance members for each fiscal year is presented in Table 8. Data presented in Table 8 is ranked based on the total number of approved country-specific projects sponsored by the Alliance members as of 30 June 2009.

Figure 14 Total Project Sponsorship for Country-Specific Projects
Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009



* Associate member

Notes:

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

Table 8 Project Sponsorship for Country-Specific Projects*Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009*

Rank	Cities Alliance Member	Project Approval Fiscal Year										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total
1	World Bank	10	16	3	7	12	16	28	11	18	13	134
2	UN-HABITAT	3	15	7	4	3	11	11	7	10	6	77
3	United States	1	2	1	3	5	6	11	5	5	1	40
4	Germany	-	-	1	5	4	3	4	2	5	3	27
5	UNDP*	-	3	1	-	3	2	3	-	4	3	19
6	France	1	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	17
7	Asian Development Bank	-	-	-	-	2	2	6	1	1	3	15
7	UCLG	-	1	-	2	-	1	3	1	4	3	15
8	United Kingdom	1	1	3	3	3	2	-	1	-	-	14
9	UNEP	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	1	1	1	12
10	Japan	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	2	2	1	11
11	Italy	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	1	4	1	10
12	Canada	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	6
12	Brazil	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	6
13	Netherlands	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	3
14	Sweden	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
14	South Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
14	Philippines	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
15	European Union	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
15	Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
15	Metropolis	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

* Associate member


Notes:

A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.

B. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

Figure 15 illustrated the total number of approved country-specific projects sponsored by one or more than one Cities Alliance member from fiscal years 2000 – 2009. Overall, 74 per cent of approved projects were sponsored by more than one member and 48 per cent of approved projects were sponsored by one member. Detail data per fiscal year is presented in Table 9.

Figure 15 Total Number of Approved Country-Specific Projects with One or More Than One Project Sponsorship
Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009



Notes:

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
B. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

Table 9 Number of Approved Country-Specific Projects with One or More Than One Project Sponsorship
Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009

Project Sponsorship	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total
Projects with One Sponsor	8	10	5	8	4	2	2	3	3	3	48
Projects with More than One Sponsor	3	13	6	8	11	16	31	14	20	13	135
Total	11	23	11	16	15	18	33	17	23	16	183

Notes:

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; and (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities.
B. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.

The number of project sponsorships for country-specific projects by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list of recipients is presented in Table 10. In average, of the approved projects, the Lower Middle Income Country and Territories received the highest portion of project sponsorships over the last ten fiscal years.

Table 10 Project Sponsorship for Country-Specific Projects by Country Income Group (*Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009*)

Rank	Cities Alliance Member	DAC List of ODA Recipients				
		Least Developed Countries	Other Low Income Countries	Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories	Upper Middle Income Countries and Territories	Part II
1	World Bank	32	37	48	17	5
2	UN-HABITAT	23	23	25	8	-
3	United States	6	14	12	5	3
4	Germany	10	-	16	3	-
5	UNDP*	8	5	4	1	1
6	France	8	2	3	4	-
7	Asian Development Bank	2	7	8	-	-
7	UCLG	5	3	3	4	-
8	United Kingdom	3	8	4	1	-
9	UNEP	5	1	4	2	-
10	Japan	2	7	2	-	-
11	Italy	-	-	7	3	-
12	Canada	1	-	5	-	-
12	Brazil	-	-	3	3	-
13	Netherlands	1	2	-	-	-
14	Sweden	-	2	-	-	-
14	South Africa	1	1	-	-	-
14	Philippines	-	-	2	-	-
15	European Union	1	-	-	-	-
15	Ethiopia	1	-	-	-	-
15	Metropolis	-	-	-	1	-
	Total	109	112	146	52	9

* Associate member

Notes:

- A. Classification of Cities Alliance projects was based on the most current list available at the time of project approval.
- B. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- C. Projects cancelled during preparation or implementation were included in the calculation.
- D. For country-specific projects with multiple countries, the countries were calculated separately in this review.

8. PROJECT PARTNERS


8.1 GRANT RECIPIENTS FOR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS

The grant recipient is the organisation that receives the funding tranches/advances and is responsible for the funds allocated for the project and for reporting. The grant recipient may or may not be an implementing partner, and a project may have more than one grant recipient. Data on grant recipients in this report is based on signed grant agreements.

Figure 16 shows the total number of grant recipients for the last ten fiscal years by organisation category. Overall, 68 per cent of grant agreements were signed by development and international/regional organisations (development co-operations, multi- and bi-lateral organisations). Grant recipients by the municipal/sub-national, network/association/foundation and national government categories share fairly balanced percentages.

Figure 17 illustrates the grant amount ratio received by grant recipient for fiscal years 2000 – 2009. It shows figures that are similar to those depicted in Figure 16; the development and international/regional organisations (development co-operations, multi- and bi-lateral organisations) received the largest grant amounts (71 per cent), while the three categories of municipal/sub-national, network/association/foundation and national government share fairly balanced percentages.


Figure 16 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects
Number of Recipients for Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009



Notes:

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (4) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreements had been issued and no disbursements made.

Figure 17 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects
Grant Amount for Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009




Notes:


- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (4) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreements had been issued and no disbursements made.

Figure 18 indicates the grant recipients by organisation category for fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009. The figures demonstrate similar patterns in comparison with the ten-year numbers shown in Figure 16. More than 50 per cent of the grant agreements were signed by development and international/regional organisations (development co-operations, multi- and bi-lateral organisations), while the other categories also show a fairly balanced distribution.

Figure 19 depicts the ratio of grant recipients by member and non-member status. The grant agreement signed by members received the highest ratio over the last ten fiscal years in comparison with the grant agreements signed by non-members. While the ratio for members remained high over that period, the trend shows that there was a gradual increase in the ratio for non-members from year to year. In fiscal year 2009, the ratio shows a balance among the two categories.

Figure 18 Grant Recipients for Country-Specific Projects for Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009**Notes:**

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreements had been issued and no disbursements made.

Figure 19 Members and Non-Member Grant Recipients for Country Specific Projects (Fiscal Years 2000 – 2009)**Notes:**

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreements had been issued and no disbursements made.


8.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS FOR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS

Grant recipients, co-financing partners and other partners involved in the implementation of a project are considered to be project implementing partners. Data on implementing partners presented in this report is based on information captured in the approved proposals.

Figure 20 shows the total number of project implementing partners by organisation category over the last ten fiscal years. The data show that the highest percentage of involvement in project implementation is shared between two categories: the development and international/regional organisations (development co-operations, multi- and bi-lateral organisations) and national governments. The second highest involvement in project implementation, with a fairly balanced ratio, is shared between municipal/sub-national and network/association/foundation categories. The rest, with a somewhat balance ratio, is shared among the academia/research institute, NGOs/civil society and other (includes the private sector) categories.


In comparison, Figure 21 illustrates the total number of project implementing partners by organisation category for fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009. The figures for those three years show a similar trend as the overall figures.

Figure 20 Project Implementing Partners for Country-Specific Projects
Number of Implementing Partners for Fiscal Years 2000 - 2009



Notes:

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreements had been issued and no disbursements made.

Figure 21 Project Implementing Partners for Country-Specific Projects for Fiscal Years 2007, 2008 and 2009**Notes:**

- A. Projects do not include: (1) Land, Services and Citizenship for the Urban Poor Activities; (2) Community-Led Infrastructure Finance Facility (CLIFF) Activities; (3) Slum Upgrading Facility (SUF) Activities; and (4) Regional-Global Projects.
- B. Projects cancelled during preparation were not included in the calculation, as no grant agreements had been issued and no disbursements made.