Terms of reference for an

Evaluation of project implementation modalities of the Cities Alliance
Draft version as of June 16, 2009

Background

The Cities Alliance is a global coalition of cities and their development partners committed to scaling up successful approaches to poverty reduction. The Alliance brings cities together in a direct dialogue with bilateral and multilateral agencies and financial institutions. The Alliance promotes the developmental role of local governments and helps cities of all sizes obtain more coherent international support. By promoting the positive impacts of urbanization, the Alliance helps local authorities plan and prepare for future growth; develop sustainable financing strategies; and attract long-term capital investments for infrastructure and other services.

In addition to supporting learning and policy dialogues, the Alliance provides matching grants in support of:
- o City development strategies (CDS) which link the process by which local stakeholders define their vision for their city and its economic growth, environmental and poverty reduction objectives, with clear priorities for actions and investments; and
- o Citywide and nationwide slum upgrading in accordance with the Alliance's Cities Without Slums Action Plan (MDG Target 11), including promoting secure tenure, access to shelter finance and policies to help cities prevent the growth of new slums.

The Cities Alliance does not have an implementation structure on its own. Grants can be given to members of the Cities Alliance, to national or local governments, to NGOs, and other organizations. In terms of financial management, most of the projects are implemented by the members of the alliance ("member execution"). World Bank and UN Habitat have received most of the grants. Three quarters of the grant recipients during fiscal years 2000 through 2008 were members of the CA. In the last few years, the number of projects implemented by non-members has increased.

One of the objectives of the Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is "to systematically increase ownership and leadership of cities and countries". The management of CA grants by the local government of the city where the project is executed, "client execution", is considered as an important means to promote project ownership. "Client execution" might also refer to projects on national level, managed by national governments.

As some conceptual and administrative concerns about the effectiveness of CA- policies and project implementation modalities, among them "client execution", were expressed by the Consultative Group, a systematic evaluation is needed.

In addition, within the regulatory framework of the World Bank, the Cities Alliance is working on improving the project cycle to make it more user-friendly and at the same time supportive to high quality projects. Some issues, i.e. concerning grant application, approval and disbursement, have been identified already and are being addressed by the CA secretariat. Additional learning from the experience and the concerns of partners and sponsors will be especially helpful to further improve the project cycle management by partners, sponsors and the CA secretariat. The project cycle includes the preparation of proposals, their submission and approval, project implementation and evaluation.

Objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation of client and of CA members' grant execution for CDS and SU projects in cities or on national level should provide evidence to assess the applicability and effects of each of the two implementation modalities.
Recommendations based on this evidence shall provide guidance to the Cities Alliance regarding the project implementation modalities and the project management cycle in terms of user friendliness as well as the quality of projects and their results.
Findings and recommendations should be suitable for decision making at the strategic level by the Consultative Group as well as for the managerial level of project partners and the CA secretariat.

Expected results

The evaluation should elaborate in depth on the following analyses and generate corresponding findings and recommendations:

- What is the conceptual benchmark for assessing ownership, leadership and project outcomes in the context of the Cities Alliance?
  - Considering the specific character of the CA, suggest adequate definitions and indicators of "project-ownership" and "project-leadership", "relevance", "effectiveness", "impacts", "efficiency" and "sustainability". The recommendations should emanate from the definitions of OECD-DAC, the CA draft document "Assessment Criteria for CDS or SU Project Proposals", as well as the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda.

- How is ownership and leadership exercised in the selected CA projects?
  - Analyze how the different parties involved in the project (local governments, national governments, sponsors, CA secretariat, others) perceive ownership, leadership and partnership in the project.
  - Analyze the factual and perceived influence of each party during the project cycle, mainly on the identification of the project, its design, the execution process, on project outputs and results, on learning, dissemination and scaling up.

- Identify strengths and flaws in stakeholder participation, ownership, leadership and partnership. Among other, consider the criteria given by the Accra Agenda (common use of systems, use of local systems),
- What mechanisms were applied to create and support ownership, by whom and to what effect?
- To what extent can the modality of implementation ("member execution" versus "client execution") be related to the intensity and quality of ownership and leadership exercised by the partners?
- Based on this evidence and correspondent findings, what can project partners, sponsors and the CA secretariat do to improve participation, project ownership and leadership?

- How can ownership, leadership and partnership increase the quality of the projects?
  - Assess the selected projects in terms of relevance, effectiveness, impacts, efficiency and sustainability as defined above.
  - Analyze the type (intermittent advisory services, project implementation units etc.) and assess the effectiveness of advisory services delivered to the partners, as well as the mechanisms for the identification, selection, procurement and evaluation of consultants.
  - With a view to participation, ownership, leadership and advisory services, what are favorable conditions, what are obstacles for achieving high project quality? Analyze the links between these findings and the modality of implementation.
  - What criteria should be applied to select the most adequate mode of implementation for a given project?
  - In case of "client execution", what specific support should be provided by sponsors and the CA secretariat to the implementing partner?
  - Based on this evidence and correspondent findings, what can project partners, sponsors and the CA secretariat do to improve the quality of the projects?

- How can the administrative management during the project cycle be more user friendly, cost efficient and supportive to high project quality?
  - Analyze the experiences of the project partners and the CA secretariat and identify the factual and perceived obstacles related to the administrative project management, including the grant management and financial management, among project partners (e.g. work flows, financial management, communication, and other). The internal management of individual project partners should be considered only to the extent they present recurrent obstacles to project execution.
  - Identify the risks for each implementing party and the CA secretariat in terms of integrity, accountability and transparency associated with each for each modalities of implementation. How can risk management in terms of integrity, accountability and transparency be improved?
  - What are the administrative strengths and flaws projects' partners experienced during the project cycle?

- Based on this evidence and correspondent findings, what can project partners, sponsors and the CA secretariat do to improve the administrative management of the projects? It is not expected to analyze the existing World Bank procedures as such, but their handling by the project partners and the secretariat.

Methodology

The methodology will be proposed in the Consultant's Proposal, and will be further developed by the consultant and presented in the Inception Report. The methodology should include, but is not be limited to:

- Review of Cities Alliance key documents including the Charter, the 2007 Universalia, the IEG and the Swedish/Norwegian evaluations of the Cities Alliance, as well as the Alliance's responses to the findings; and the 2009 Portfolio Review.

- In depth analysis of the following projects:
  4-6 projects each of:
    o *projects with grants implemented by multilateral organizations (World Bank and UN Habitat),*
    o *projects with grants implemented by bilateral agencies (USAID, GTZ),*
    o *projects with grants implemented by local or national governments,*
    o *projects implemented by other organizations.*

  Projects are still to be selected. Field visits will probably be requested to anglophone and francophone Africa, possibly also in lusophone countries. Desk studies will include Spanish speaking countries.

  The analysis of the projects should be based on a mix of field visits (minimum of four projects), desk studies of the project documentation available in the CA secretariat, and interviews (i.e. project partners such as local or national government, task managers, sponsors and other stakeholders, CA secretariat staff). Such interviews may include telephone, email, video conference communications and personal interviews. Project documentation includes applications screening, grant progress and completion reports, project evaluation reports, correspondence with the secretariat.

  The consultant is expected to apply analytical tools which permit comparisons across the projects, and which are suitable to capture viewpoints from a universe of diverse parties. Complementary quantitative methods should be used where feasible.

The consultant will prepare an inception report in English to be approved by the CA secretariat. The inception report will, among other, further specify the methodology to be used. The consultant may sub-contract certain tasks or topics, to be specified in the proposal and the inception report.
Upon approval of the inception report, the consultant will proceed with the in depth analysis of the projects.

An Interim progress report offers a chance to redirect the work of the consultants in case there has been any ambiguity or misunderstanding of the content or emphasis of the ToR or any other information.

The written final report should be in English, and not to exceed 60 pages, excluding appendixes. It should include an executive summary and a comprehensive narrative of evidence, findings and recommendations. The appendix should provide an adequate level of documentation to sustain the findings and recommendations.
The presentation of findings should be clearly sustained by the evidence found. Recommendations should be action oriented on the strategic as well as on the managerial level, and clearly addressing the corresponding actors.

The consultant should be in a position to present and discuss the recommendations with the Consultative Group and the CA secretariat in Washington or other locations.

Time schedule

	Approval of ToR by ExCo
	Public Announcement made by CA
	Expressions of Interest from consultancies received
	Review of TOR and EOIs by ExCo, Request proposals from consultancies to short-list
	Evaluation of proposals and selection of consultancy (ExCo and secretariat)
	Contracting of consultancy
	Inception report from selected consultancy, including the detailed work plan, to be approved by the Secretariat in consultation with ExCo
	Interim progress report from consultancy to the CA, recommendations from the CA to the consultancy
	First draft final report from the consultancy to the CA. Debriefings of consultancy to CG (or its representatives) and Secretariat.
	Feedback on the draft report from Cities Alliance members and secretariat.
	Final report to CA
	Consultant presents findings

Contributions from project partners
• Make time available to cooperate with evaluation team.
• Facilitate contacts with others within member's organizations, and with external stakeholders, as appropriate.
• Provide project documentation and other project related information, as appropriate.

Obligations of the CA secretariat
• Provide key documents
Provide access to the project data base
• Facilitate contacts with Alliance constituents.
• Provide temporary office space at Alliance headquarters, as appropriate.
• Facilitate access to World Bank video conference facilities.
• Ensure independence of the evaluation.

Obligations of the consultant
• Inform the CA Secretariat in timely fashion of all contacts made with Alliance constituents.
• Treat documents in confidential manner.
• Not publish evaluation results or output without permission from the Secretariat.
• Return all Cities Alliance documents used in the evaluation.
• Report on a timely basis any possible conflicts of interest.

Additional Information
Background information on the Cities Alliance (including its Charter, annual reports, and list of activities financed) can be obtained from its website: www.citiesalliance.org.