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1. CITIES ALLIANCE RESULTS AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

COMMENTS ON THE CURRENT EDITION:
The Cities Alliance Results Framework at the basis of this Scorecard was tested for a three-year period starting in 2013. Geographically, the Scorecard covered those communities, cities and countries that were part of the five initial Cities Alliance Country Programmes: Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mozambique, Uganda and Vietnam. Targets were set to the end of 2016, coinciding with the expected operational closure of these programmes. As those programmes ended as expected in Q4 2016, this edition of the Scorecard is particularly significant. As in the past, it captures the progress made; most importantly, though, it captures the development results of these programmatic interventions through the collection of end-line studies.

In 2016 the Cities Alliance also engaged Accenture to evaluate the performance and impact of its Country Programmes in Ghana, Uganda and Vietnam. The Accenture report was issued in March 2017 and is available on the Cities Alliance website. The evaluation was instrumental in validating the overall strength of the monitoring approach of the Cities Alliance, as well as the data and results featured in this Scorecard.

1.1 BACKGROUND
As per its Charter, the main objective of the Cities Alliance is to reduce urban poverty and promote the role of cities in sustainable development. To assess the extent to which its efforts and those of partners are making progress toward that objective, the Cities Alliance monitors, evaluates and reports its activities within an agreed-upon performance and results framework and through dedicated comprehensive monitoring tools.

Corporate Scorecard. This corporate scorecard serves as a snapshot of the Cities Alliance's overall performance and results up to the end of 2016 and as a report to the Management Board. It provides the Cities Alliance with information on the achievement of development results, effectiveness in achieving those results, and outcomes. Indicators reflect the typical suite of technical assistance services to the urban poor.

Performance Indicators Monitoring System (PIMS). This framework is defined operationally by the PIMS, which operationalises the 47 indicators into baselines, milestones and targets, data sources, and tools and frequency for data collection. The PIMS operates across Secretariat operations, programmes and portfolios and the organisation as a whole. The PIMS is not only about monitoring, controls and tracking emerging results; it is also about learning – for both clients and the Cities Alliance as a partnership - that can be applied in the planning and design of new activities.

1.2. TIERS EXPLAINED

Tier I: Millennium Development Goals. This tier is primarily contextual and reports on the long-term development goals that countries are achieving. The universe of measurement is the countries where Cities Alliance has a long-term engagement. Developmental impact is measured in terms of livelihood of the target population – the urban poor – across three aspects: slums (Target 11 - entrenched with Cities Alliance history), health, and participation. Impact levels here are well beyond the control of the Cities Alliance which, as such, is not responsible for delivering these objectives.

In the future, some of these indicators will be revisited to align them to the new Sustainable Development Goal (SDG).

Tier II: Partner results as supported by Cities Alliance members. The Cities Alliance provides technical assistance programmes and services to leverage the financing that helps cities to be more effective, participatory and able to deliver improved, responsive services to the urban poor.

While Cities Alliance members are the clients of the Secretariat, the cities (broadly defined) is the client of the Cities Alliance. Cities and national government partners are responsible for results at this level. A partnership of Cities Alliance members can only support the achievement of these results in partnership with beneficiaries and partners on the ground.

Tier III: Cities Alliance programmatic results. This tier covers the programmatic activities of the Cities Alliance. With the support of the Secretariat, the partnership of Cities Alliance members provides financing and implementation of technical assistance to local and national partners within a long-term programmatic framework of cooperation (Country Programmes) across four major areas of operations: partnerships; Technical Assistance activities; knowledge products and policy dialogues; and management of Cities Alliance governance. The Secretariat is responsible and accountable for delivering those outputs. It is the Secretariat’s Terms of Reference. It does so through its three Business Lines: (1) Country Programmes; (2) Catalytic Fund; and (3) Joint Work Programmes.

WHAT’S NEW FROM LAST YEAR

New indicators. We have added new key performance indicators at the Secretariat level (Tier IV) to cover three important corporate areas which were not previously captured: Our environmental footprint, progress on gender mainstreaming (a pillar of the Medium-Term Strategy), and ability to deliver against the corporate workplan. The new indicators are numbered respectively IV.4.7, IV.4.8 and IV.4.9 (see Annex I for a detailed definition).

Geographic expansion. The RF/PIMS was pilot tested within the five active Country Programmes. Given its usefulness in the management of these programme, many of these indicators were also included in the M&E plan of the Country Programme in Liberia and Tunisia. This means that the next period already has a new geographical universe in place against which our progress can be measured.

Alignment. As envisaged, this year we have further structured the Annual Report around the Scorecard. The quantitative results are thus complemented by the qualitative narrative of the Report, which captures the most significant changes within Cities Alliance programmes in the current calendar year.

FIGURE 1: THE CITIES ALLIANCE RESULTS CHAIN

- **Tier I**: Millennium Development Goals
- **Tier II**: Partner results
- **Tier III**: Cities Alliance programmatic results
- **Tier IV**: Secretariat performance

CA Programme Impact: Improved quality of life, income, and inclusion of the urban poor

Catalytic Fund; and (3) Joint Work Programmes.
2. SUMMARY OF CORPORATE SCORECARD
[targets end of 2016]

TIER I - IMPACT

LEGEND:

- **CHALLENGE.** Majority of indicators show decrease from baseline, have failed in achieving the established target or are significantly far under the established performance standards.
- **WATCH.** Majority of indicators show no significant increase or decrease from baseline, have not yet achieved the established target, or are under the established performance standard although within tolerance.
- **ON TRACK.** Majority of indicators show significant increase from baseline and/or have achieved the established target. For indicators based on performance standards (Tier IV), indicator meets/exceeds the established performance standard.
- **SUSTAINABLE.** Targets/performance standards are consistently achieved and mechanisms/processes underlying change are institutionalised and/or maintained without external assistance.
- **NOT APPLICABLE.** There is insufficient data to establish a trend, or there is no target or performance standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.1</td>
<td>Percentage of city population living in slums¹</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55.1% (2007/09)</td>
<td>53% (2014)</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.2</td>
<td>Percentage of households in urban areas that exist without secure tenure</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.3</td>
<td>Under age 5 mortality rate in urban areas ¹</td>
<td>Pkr 1000</td>
<td>93.2 (2008/10/13)</td>
<td>81.3 (2016)</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.4</td>
<td>Participation of urban poor in the voting population*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60.3% (2007/08/09/11)</td>
<td>64.4% (2012/14/15/16)</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tier I indicators lack some values. This reflects data gaps in the MDG official statistics provided by the national institutes of statistics and UNStats (data on tenure security have never been collected). Furthermore, Tier I indicators are also expected to be changed to reflect and realign to the consensus on the new SDGs.

† The baseline and end-line years are not always the same for all countries due to data availability. However, the essential is that change is measured over a period of approximately 3 to 6 years.

‡ To be noted that significant improvements have been made in Ghana, Mozambique, Uganda and Vietnam, but this is offset by the negative data trends for Burkina Faso.

§ Figures based on Burkina Faso, Mozambique and Uganda only. Data not available for Ghana and Vietnam. Due to the lack of data, figures are estimated by projecting the baseline data to 2016 using the WHO annual relative change in the indicator.

* As not available, data for the voter participation has not been disaggregated for the urban poor. The data used here is for the turnout of the total voting age population in parliamentary elections.

3. THE SCORECARD

LEGEND:

- **CHALLENGE.** For indicators based on targets (Tiers II&III), indicator shows a decrease from baseline and/or has failed in achieving the established target. For indicators based on performance standards (Tier IV), indicator is significantly far under the established performance standard.
- **WATCH.** For indicators based on targets (Tiers II&III), indicator shows no significant increase or decrease from baseline and/or has not yet achieved the established target. For indicators based on performance standards (Tier IV), indicator is under the established performance standard although within tolerance.
- **ON TRACK.** For indicators based on targets (Tiers II&III), indicator shows significant increase from baseline and/or has achieved the established target. For indicators based on performance standards (Tier IV), indicator meets/exceeds the established performance standard.
- **SUSTAINABLE.** Targets/performance standards are consistently achieved and mechanisms/processes underlying change are institutionalised and/or maintained without external assistance.
- **NOT APPLICABLE.** There is insufficient data to establish a trend, or there is no target or performance standard.

For Tiers I, colour-coded traffic lights and targets are not provided since they pertain to the macro developmental context.
TIER II - OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>INDICATORS*</th>
<th>CRITERIA (ONLY MEASURED IN CITIES AND AREAS WHERE CITIES ALLIANCE WORKS)</th>
<th>BASELINE (2010 - 13)</th>
<th>ENDLINE (2015 - 16)</th>
<th>TARGET 2016</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1.1</td>
<td>Average municipal expenditures per person per year</td>
<td>US$ (total expenditures / population)</td>
<td>42.58 USD (2013)</td>
<td>66.11 USD (2015/16)</td>
<td>44.71 USD</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.2</td>
<td>Average number of municipal employees per 1000 inhabitants per year</td>
<td>1000 [# Employees / total population]</td>
<td>3.14 (2013)</td>
<td>3.33 (2015/16)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.3</td>
<td>Average number of women among municipal employees</td>
<td>% [women employees / total municipal employees]</td>
<td>35% (2013)</td>
<td>35% (2015/16)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4</td>
<td>Proportion of municipal employees with post-secondary education.</td>
<td>% [employees with education / total municipal employees]</td>
<td>47% (2013)</td>
<td>52% (2015/16)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5</td>
<td>Average percentage of voter participation</td>
<td>% of all eligible voters</td>
<td>58% (2010/2013)</td>
<td>56% (2015/16)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6</td>
<td>Average percentage of women voter participation</td>
<td>% of all eligible women</td>
<td>62% (2010/2013)</td>
<td>63% (2015/16)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.7</td>
<td>Average ratings on existence of a municipal website for citizen questions and answers</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>0.96 (2013)</td>
<td>1.01 (2015/16)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.8</td>
<td>Average ratings on functioning of local-level structures for consultations</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>1.43 (2013)</td>
<td>1.51 (2015/16)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.9</td>
<td>Average ratings on participatory planning process in place (budgetary or other)</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>1.41 (2013)</td>
<td>1.23 (2015/16)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.10</td>
<td>Average ratings on levels of civil society activity in municipality.</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>1.30 (2013)</td>
<td>1.40 (2015/16)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.11</td>
<td>Average proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with regular access to potable water</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>59% (2013)</td>
<td>74% (2015/16)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.12</td>
<td>Average proportion of kilometres of maintained roads/paths in slum and/or low-income areas</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35% (2013)</td>
<td>41% (2015/16)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.13</td>
<td>Average proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with safe water connections</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>51% (2013)</td>
<td>51% (2015/16)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.14</td>
<td>Average proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with regular electricity connection</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56% (2013)</td>
<td>71% (2015/16)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.15</td>
<td>Average proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with regular solid waste collection</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>46% (2013)</td>
<td>60% (2015/16)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.16</td>
<td>Effectiveness of advocacy and knowledge product dissemination - Average Official Development Assistance for urban development</td>
<td>US$ (100,000 / # ODA flows)</td>
<td>30.6 (2013)</td>
<td>N/A (2015/16)</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.17</td>
<td>Effectiveness of advocacy and knowledge product dissemination - Average ratings for prominence of city and urban themes in corporate strategic directions [Cities Alliance members]</td>
<td>Scale [0-2]</td>
<td>1.6 (2013)</td>
<td>N/A (2015/16)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data from Burkina Faso is a strong outlier: there was a drop of 29% while all other countries have improved. The figures in Burkina Faso could be explained by the different electoral recording systems employed by the Government but also by a growing political disillusionment on the wake of the 2013 political crisis.

TIER II: BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

This Tier describes the impact that Cities Alliance’s technical assistance services aim to have on cities, specifically on more effective governance (indicators II.1.1 to II.1.4), inclusiveness and participation (indicators II.1.5 to II.1.10), and ability to deliver improved, responsive services to the urban poor (indicators II.1.11 to II.1.15). These 15 indicators are mostly of a quantitative nature. Results within this Tier assume that the Cities Alliance’s technical assistance services are, in fact, able to leverage and translate into effective follow-up investments and/or additional fiscal transfers. Indeed, investments to strengthen local authorities and develop pro-poor infrastructure allow cities to better cater to their citizenry - especially the most marginalised.

During the period under analysis (2013/14 to 2016), data for these city indicators was initially collected through baseline studies, and has been updated in conjunction with programme closure – i.e. second half of 2016 - ex-end-line studies. Collecting data for this Tier annually was judged to be too expensive and not very effective in measuring progress and attribution. Impact at this level needs to be assessed over longer timeframes, so that it includes actual outcomes from the funds leveraged through the technical assistance and the community. Improvements are measured by comparing baseline and end-line data and by linking variations to intervention. A per cent increase in the value of the indicators between the baseline and the end-line has been calculated as the standard target.

Baseline studies were carried out between 2013 and 2014 for all the first-round Cities Alliance Country Programmes (Uganda, Ghana, Mozambique, Burkina Faso and Vietnam), which comprise the initial baseline phase of the PIMS. In Burkina Faso, the baseline study on Tier II indicators was carried out by Agence Perspective, a national consultancy firm which provided the initial diagnostic for the development of the Country Programme. In Ghana, the work was carried out by the Institute of Local Government Studies (ILGS) as part of the ‘sustainable urban local government capacity building’ grant. In Mozambique, the work was carried out in the context of the FCA programme. In Vietnam, the work was undertaken by ACVN. Given the high number of participating Vietnamese cities, a representative sample was selected based on factors including size, geography, and degree of involvement in the programme. In Uganda, the baseline study was conducted by a team within the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development.

In Ghana, the end-lines were collected by JMK Consulting Ltd; in Uganda by Statworld Consult Uganda Ltd; in Vietnam by the Association of Cities in Viet-Nam (ACVN); in Burkina Faso by UrbaConsulting; and in Mozambique by KPMG. Within this process, some of the baselines were readjusted for consistency and full synchronisation with the end-line methodologies.

TIER II: EXPLANATION OF THE VARIANCES AND ATTRIBUTION

The assessment of Tier II indicators has been carried out based on the data collected for the five countries (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mozambique, Uganda and Vietnam).

Overall, between baselines and end-lines, 10 out of the 15 indicators exceed their targets of 5 per cent positive change. The group of indicators measuring better service delivery and access by the urban poor (II.1.11 to II.1.15) show on average the best performance (20 per cent increase), closely followed by this indicator group of effective governance (indicators II.1.1 to II.1.4) with 19 per cent increase. The indicator group measuring inclusiveness and participation (indicators II.1.5 to II.1.10) registered the lowest improvement (1 per cent). Among individual indicators, the sharpest increase is observed in indicator II.1.1 (Average municipal expenditure per person per year), which registered a 55 per cent increase between 2013 and 2016.

As also highlighted in a recent assessment, an area that calls for more attention in the Country Programmes is gender. The two related indicators on the value and number of women among municipal employees, and II.1.6 Average percentage of women voter participation (II.1.6) fall short of their targets. Another challenging indicator is II.1.9, Average ratings on participatory planning process in place (budgetary or other). While this indicator showed improvements in Uganda and Vietnam, it decreased largely in Ghana and slightly in Burkina Faso during the period under examination. Despite the successful implementation of both the community strengthening activities and the multi-stakeholder engagements through municipal and settlement level fora within the Ghana and Burkina Faso Country Programmes, this has not (yet) translated into a perceived structural change. Generally, there may be the time lapse between the investments in institutional change and the broader impact on citizens’ perception of that change.

Specifically, the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area (GAMA) underwent a lengthy municipal election process, which weakened ownership among some of the newly established participatory mechanisms; and in Burkina Faso, the maturity of the participatory processes was delayed by the political crisis. Indicator II.1.5 (Average percentage of voter participation in the most recent municipal election) also shows a decline due to the data from Burkina Faso, where there was a drop of 29% (while all other countries improved). The figures in Burkina Faso could be explained by the different electoral recording systems employed by the Government, but also by a growing political disillusionment on the wake of the 2013 political crisis.

† † Please note that the overall average of the indicator is also affected by its baseline data. At the point of baseline data collection (in 2013), some of the participatory mechanisms of the country programmes had already been put in place with many cities hence receiving the maximum score of 2. Since the manifestations of the change were slowly attained, additional gains and improvements could not be captured at the end line point. Improvements could also not be captured at the end line point.

§ § Please note that the overall average of the indicator is also affected by its baseline data. At the point of baseline data collection (in 2013), some of the participatory mechanisms of the country programmes had already been put in place with many cities hence receiving the maximum score of 2. Since the manifestations of the change were slowly attained, additional gains and improvements could not be captured at the end line point. Improvements could also not be captured at the end line point.

11 The availability of data for indicator II.1.6 also proved challenging.
Cities Alliance interventions. Due to the well-known attribution gap, some instances may be attributed more directly, while others should be considered as a contribution.

- The most direct linkages to the indicators on access (indicators II.1.11 to II.1.15) are through direct physical changes that are strongly evidenced by the CEE rating reports, which attest an improved evolution of the city enabling environment in the five countries of focus in the period between 2012 and 2015. It is also easy to link improvements to the follow-up investment of USD 292 million by the World Bank in the Mekong Delta Region Urban Upgrading National Urban Upgrading Programme (NUUP) in Vietnam, which was funded by the Country Programme. The Detailed Implementation Strategy for the NUUP, which was developed, was used to inform the investment. In Uganda, the World Bank invested USD 150 million on water and sanitation infrastructure in GAMA areas – improvement and expansion of the water supply network as well as rehabilitation/constitution of priority treatment facilities. In Ghana, the in-depth WASH assessment and plans/options for GAMA were considered for this indicator. These assessments were used to inform the investment of USD 292 million by the World Bank in the Mekong Delta Region Urban Upgrading Project (MDR-UUP) for infrastructure projects in low income areas.

- A more indirect contribution (on the same set of indicators) is provided by those funds that have been directly leveraged by the TA assistance activities for follow up infrastructure investments. In Ghana, the World Bank invested USD 150 million on water and sanitation infrastructure in GAMA areas – improvement and expansion of the water supply network as well as rehabilitation/constitution of priority treatment facilities. In India, the World Bank invested USD 150 million within the Country Programme to provide substantial additional funds to the targeted municipalities for investment in urban infrastructure (roads, waste management, local economic infrastructure and urban transport such as bus terminals). These capital investments were identified and prioritised through the local governments’ participation in the development of urban infrastructure strategies and plans developed, and resources mobilised.

- For those indicators related to the effectiveness of local governance and citizenship, the link with the Technical Assistance (TA) is less direct; however, an important contributing factor is still traceable. The positive attention generated by the programme on urban issues, together with the establishment of legal and policy frameworks and the strengthening of local and national institutions on urban issues, have undoubtedly raised the profile of cities – drawing attention and corrective actions to the way they are managed, their capacity and financial resources. In India, the Country Programme mobilised funds to support several small community infrastructure projects which have directly improved access to basic services in many of the targeted communities. One hundred and eighty-eight (188) community infrastructure projects have been implemented in these four Country Programmes. In Mozambique, some of the funding was used to physically upgrade the Chamanuculo C neighbourhood of Maputo, through the tripartite partnership between the Cities Alliance, the Government of Brazil and the Government of Italy. Across all countries, infrastructure projects were selected through a participatory approach by the communities themselves according to their infrastructure priorities and aligned with municipal plans. Projects were mainly on the construction, improvement and maintenance of basic infrastructure such as WASH facilities, electricity supply, waste management, roads and public/communal spaces. These small-scale projects have made a significant impact and explain many of the positive variations in the above numbers. The beneficiaries of the small infrastructure projects include the estimated 22,371 households of Chamanuculo C neighbourhood, 92,300 individuals in low income urban areas of 5 cities in Burkina Faso, about 523,185 inhabitants of urban poor communities in 2 Ugandan municipalities, 2,411 households in 10 Vietnamese cities, and the inhabitants of Ashaiman and Ledzokuku-Kwokor municipalities as well as Old Fadama slum community in the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area.

- A more indirect contribution (on the same set of indicators) is provided by those funds that have been directly leveraged by the TA assistance activities for follow up infrastructure investments. In Ghana, the World Bank invested USD 150 million on water and sanitation infrastructure in GAMA areas – improvement and expansion of the water supply network as well as rehabilitation/constitution of priority treatment facilities. In India, the World Bank invested USD 150 million within the Country Programme to provide substantial additional funds to the targeted municipalities for investment in urban infrastructure (roads, waste management, local economic infrastructure and urban transport such as bus terminals). These capital investments were identified and prioritised through the local governments’ participation in the development of urban infrastructure strategies and plans developed, and resources mobilised. The programmes in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Uganda and Vietnam have established local Funds to support several small community infrastructure projects which have directly improved access to basic services in many of the targeted communities. These small-scale projects have made a significant impact and explain many of the positive variations in the above numbers. The beneficiaries of the small infrastructure projects include the estimated 22,371 households of Chamanuculo C neighbourhood, 92,300 individuals in low income urban areas of 5 cities in Burkina Faso, about 523,185 inhabitants of urban poor communities in 2 Ugandan municipalities, 2,411 households in 10 Vietnamese cities, and the inhabitants of Ashaiman and Ledzokuku-Kwokor municipalities as well as Old Fadama slum community in the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area.

**TIER II - CONTRIBUTION OF AND CONCEPTUAL TO IMPROVEMENTS**

There are three main modalities in which the improvements recorded in Tier II indicators can be causally connected to the follow-up interventions funded by community development/upgrading funds. The programmes in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Uganda and Vietnam have established local funds to support several small community infrastructure projects which have directly improved access to basic services in many of the targeted communities. One hundred and eighty-eight (188) community infrastructure projects have been implemented in these four Country Programmes. In Mozambique, some of the funding was used to physically upgrade the Chamanuculo C neighbourhood of Maputo, through the tripartite partnership between the Cities Alliance, the Government of Brazil and the Government of Italy. Across all countries, infrastructure projects were selected through a participatory approach by the communities themselves according to their infrastructure priorities and aligned with municipal plans. Projects were mainly on the construction, improvement and maintenance of basic infrastructure such as WASH facilities, electricity supply, waste management, roads and public/communal spaces. These small-scale projects have made a significant impact and explain many of the positive variations in the above numbers. The beneficiaries of the small infrastructure projects include the estimated 22,371 households of Chamanuculo C neighbourhood, 92,300 individuals in low income urban areas of 5 cities in Burkina Faso, about 523,185 inhabitants of urban poor communities in 2 Ugandan municipalities, 2,411 households in 10 Vietnamese cities, and the inhabitants of Ashaiman and Ledzokuku-Kwokor municipalities as well as Old Fadama slum community in the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area.
TIER III: BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

These indicators are mainly maturity scales which develop from an initial stage at inception to maturity at the end of the programme (in terms of optimisation, institutionalisation, scaling up, etc.). Most of the targets have been set to be ‘green’ at the end of 2016, which coincides with the end of the Land, Services and Citizenship (LSC) programme that funded the initial five Country Programmes subject of this scorecard. Annex II provides a snapshot of Tier III across the different cities and countries participating in the Country Programmes.

TIER III: EVIDENCE

III.1.1a and b. Number of countries with national urban policy(ies) developed and adopted

Development. The Uganda National Policy was developed over a period of four years through extensive analysis and consultations driven by the Policy Working Group of the Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD). The policy was finalised in 2014. The Ghana National Urban Policy (NUP) was developed by the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development with the support of GIZ through a participatory process over a four-year period and finalised in May 2012. Subsequently, the NUP has been further strengthened in the context of the Country Programme with the addition of an implementation plan and a monitoring and financing framework for its implementation. In Vietnam, the initial Cities Alliance investment to develop a national urban policy has leveraged an additional USD 2 million from Asian Development Bank (ADB) and USAID in support of the activity. What started as a Cities Alliance process has grown into a broader policy dialogue that is expected to culminate in a Prime Ministerial decree in support of the urban development policy by 2018. In Mozambique, the Decentralisation Working Group, comprising of the national government and development partners has been established and is actively championing national urban policy dialogues.

Adoption. The Ghana National Urban Policy was launched in March 2013 along with an Action Plan for its implementation, which is now fully in progress. In Uganda, the final national urban policy has been submitted to the Cabinet for final adoption.

III.1.2 Number of countries with national urban policy frameworks developed

Both the national policies in Ghana and Uganda are general frameworks that move beyond a sectoral lens in favour of a more integrated approach to urban development. The Uganda National Urban Policy provides direction for government agencies and local authorities to plan, implement, and effectively manage urban growth. The policy comprehensively tackles issues of urban poverty, waste management, unemployment, pollution and environmental degradation, urban disasters, crime, housing, congestion, infrastructure and urban governance.

The Ghana National Urban Policy is a framework of integrated directives on urban demographics and distribution, landforms, safety, governance, economy, service delivery, financial management, and the environment. The policy pays due consideration to the need for inclusion of the urban poor and vulnerable by targeting the provision of adequate and affordable housing. Participation and accountability is emphasised through the roles of local governments. In Vietnam, a comprehensive assessment of the various national sectoral strategies has been carried out first to make comprehensive recommendations for the urban national framework.

III.2 Number of local pro-poor climate resilient strategies/plans developed

In Ghana, WASH assessments and plans were carried out for nine Low Income Urban Communities (LIUCs) within 11 Metropolitan/Municipal Assemblies (MMAs) in the GAMA area. The plans took the form of an integrated assessment of sanitation and water services inventory, and the outputs will include a national urban resilience strategy and programme, national urban planning capacity, and improved national urban planning capacity and improved at national and city levels to implement climate change adaptation plans.

In Vietnam, the initial Cities Alliance investment to develop a national urban policy has leveraged an additional USD 2 million from Asian Development Bank (ADB) and USAID in support of the activity. What started as a Cities Alliance process has grown into a broader policy dialogue that is expected to culminate in a Prime Ministerial decree in support of the urban development policy by 2018. The programme aims to provide targeted, partial subsidies that encourage households to construct facilities and service providers to serve low-income neighbourhoods. The GPOBA project started in 2015.

In Uganda, the World Bank has invested USD 150 million in WASH infrastructure. The Bank’s WASH programme started in 2013 and is expected to run through 2018. The four components of the programme are: (i) provision of environmental sanitation and water supply services to priority low-income areas of the GAMA, including targeted campaign for WASH behaviour change; (ii) planning, management and expansion of GAMe-wide environmental sanitation services; and (iii) Institutional strengthening through providing technical assistance to MMAs and national institutions. DFID has also invested USD 4.8 million to support the provision of sustainable toilet facilities in low-income areas of GAMA through the World Bank-administered Global Partnership for Output-Based Aid (GPOBA). The GPOBA investment pilots an output-based approach that provides targeted, partial subsidies that encourage households to construct facilities and service providers to serve low-income neighbourhoods. The GPOBA project started in 2015.

In Mozambique, a city development strategy (CDS) with a strong focus on resilience has been prepared by the municipality of Nampula. Local government capacity development was a strong component of this process which also involved the municipalities of Nacala and Tete with possibility for replication. In Maputo, (Chamanculo C) an integrated slum upgrading plan for the settlement was developed together with a drainage system plan for the greater area, since flooding in Chamanculo C cannot be separated from the neighbourhood’s drainage deficiencies.

In Burkina Faso, harmonisation of different planning processes, namely the Programme Communale de Développement (PCD) and the Programme d’Occupation des Sols (POS), has been successfully piloted in Teni, Kodogo, and, as the result, the Burkina Faso National Urban Forum (2016) has recommended the replication of this process in other cities of the country.

III.2.2 Average total financial resources mobilised by partners for strategy implementation

As mentioned above, building on the technical groundwork laid by the Country Programmes, there have been several direct follow-up investments by country programmes’ partners in the countries of focus:

- Ghana: The World Bank has invested USD 150 million in WASH infrastructure. The Bank’s WASH programme started in 2013 and is expected to run through 2018. The four components of the programme are: (i) provision of environmental sanitation and water supply services to priority low-income areas of the GAMA, including targeted campaign for WASH behaviour change; (ii) planning, improvement and expansion of GAMe-wide environmental sanitation services; and (iii) Institutional strengthening through providing technical assistance to MMAs and national institutions. DFID has also invested USD 4.8 million to support the provision of sustainable toilet facilities in low-income areas of GAMA through the World Bank-administered Global Partnership for Output-Based Aid (GPOBA). The GPOBA investment pilots an output-based approach that provides targeted, partial subsidies that encourage households to construct facilities and service providers to serve low-income neighbourhoods. The GPOBA project started in 2015.

- Uganda: The World Bank has invested USD 150 million in the Uganda Support to Municipal Infrastructure Development programme, which started in 2013 and is expected to run until 2019. The programme aims to improve the institutional performance in urban service delivery of selected municipalities. Its approach involves providing funds for investment in urban infrastructure in a way that in parallel improves the capacities of local and national level institutions.

- Vietnam: The World Bank has invested USD 292 million in urban infrastructure in the Mekong Delta Region Urban Upgrading Project (MDR-UUP). The MDR-UUP started in 2012 and will close in December 2017. The programme has been progressing on activities that support upgrading primary, secondary and tertiary infrastructure in low-income urban areas of Vietnam, as well as the development of resettlement areas for affected persons. The ADB and USAID are also budgeting USD 2 million for a Phase II of the Country Programme’s National Urban Development Strategy project. This second phase will be comprised of a broad-based needs assessment and service coverage inventory, and the outputs will include a national urban resilience strategy and programme, improved national urban planning capacity, and improved capacity at national and city levels to implement climate change adaptation plans.

- Mozambique: USD 2,442,800 was the financial contribution by Brazil and Italy as part of the tripartite partnership in support of the neighbourhood upgrading of Chamanculo C. Further investments in the area summing to a total of USD 5,980,731 have been made by other development partners including ADB and USAID on infrastructure projects (such as the upgrading of the principal road and drainage running through Chamanculo C) and to cover the relocation costs required to meet the safeguard standards for resettlement. An additional investment of some USD 20 million is currently under discussion by the Italian Cooperation for further upgrading work in the area and to replicate the model to other neighbourhoods.

III.3 Number of cities with regularly functioning governance mechanisms to engage citizens in urban governance

Most of the cities within the five Country Programmes have experienced significant achievements in community strengthening, which is a crucial precondition to any engagement. Overall, 31 mapping/enumeration exercises have been carried out in slum communities, fostering skills and knowledge in the communities and strengthening their negotiating power with municipal authorities. Adding to community empowerment, over 386 community savings groups have been mobilised, three national federations developed, and multiple settlement fora established across the areas and cities of intervention.

Most cities have also seen the creation and regular functioning of participatory mechanisms, where urban development priorities, issues, and investments are discussed on a multi-stakeholder and open platform. Forty-three (43) municipal
level fora have contributed to promoting participatory local governance by establishing regular dialogue between national government agencies, local authorities, communities, and the private sector. In Uganda, the success of the municipal development fora have been utilised by the World Bank’s USMID project in support of infrastructure identification and prioritisation. Cumulatively across all countries, over 700 dialogue and consultative sessions have been held between community groups and their local governments to inclusively plan and implement urban development, especially around the Community Upgrading Fund project implementation.

To further support participatory governance, guides, tools, policy papers and action plans have been developed on urban governance themes and processes.***

III.3.2 Number of countries with regularly functioning governance mechanisms to engage citizens in urban governance

National Urban Forums (NUFs) have been created and are operational in all five countries. The Mozambique National Urban Forum was successfully launched in November 2016 and is being promoted as a platform for dialogue, preparation, promotion and implementation of a national urban agenda. In Uganda, Vietnam, Burkina Faso and Ghana, the NUFs are fully institutionalised, and the responsible Ministries for urban development have mechanisms in place to plan and hold NUFs regularly. NUF charters, resolutions and strategies have been drafted and adopted to guide the scope, activities and operations of the fora. The NUF model not only serves to engage, create awareness and prioritise crucial urban issues in the countries but - in the case of Ghana - also as a platform to prepare for international policies and agreements (Habitat III).

III.3.3 Number of sustainable mechanisms to engage citizens (Catalytic Fund projects & projects at the city level)

Several mechanisms for effective citizen engagement developed over the course of the Country Programmes have been lodged sustainably in the national urban management systems. In all the countries, the NUFs have been taken up by the Ministries in charge of urban development, not only as an annual event but as a continuous process to engage urban stakeholders in policy making. 43 municipal-level fora and more than 386 community savings groups have been mobilised through the Country Programmes, and they have been instrumental in defining community infrastructure projects such as the USMID project in Uganda. In Uganda, the National Urban Policy included the municipal forum as an institutional mechanism for citizen engagement.

III.4.1 Number of cities where the capacity of local governments has been strengthened in areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management.

Capacity development has been a strong component within Country Programmes, often cutting across all projects and consistently applying a learning-by-doing approach with the local counterparts. To date, training programmes have been completed around participatory community mapping/enumeration, financial management skills, community development and upgrading funds, municipal leadership, municipal finance, municipal service delivery. Accompanying manuals and tools have been published and disseminated widely. Further capacity building is on-going in the context of the National Urban Development Strategy development in Vietnam, the Municipal Development Strategies in Uganda, and the Community Upgrading Fund in Ghana.

Over the course of the Country Programmes, about 96 training workshops and meetings and 34 exchange missions have been organised, with more than 4,800 people trained, including representatives from government ministries/departments, local government officials and technical staff, CBOs, and community leaders.

About 27 toolkits have been produced to facilitate training on urban themes such as community development, city development strategies, data collection, enumeration, strategic leadership, etc.†††

III.4.2 Number of countries in which the capacity of training and support organisations (national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) to train local government officials and current and future technical experts has been strengthened.

The capacities of urban institutions and training and support organisations have been improved over the course of the programmes by direct funding, providing platforms for networking and exchange, diagnostics and assessments, and facilitating the inclusion of these organisations into national policy making.

For instance, the institutional capacity of the Ministry of Local Governance and Rural Development in Ghana has been strengthened through support for the establishment of an Urban Development Unit (UDU) within the Ministry, and by organising capacity development for the Unit’s personnel. ILGS – the main local governance training institution in Ghana - has been provided with direct funding to support its core mission around training for local authorities and production of skill development materials on topics such as resilience, strategic planning and metropolitan governance. A new curriculum and course framework has been developed for the Mid-Level Institute for Physical and Environmental Planning (IMPFA) in Mozambique to facilitate the training of municipal technicians, especially those working in secondary cities. In Burkina Faso, support has been given to the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development to establish the Country Programme Coordination Unit and to deliver training to local governments, especially in secondary cities.

The institutional capacities of city associations have been strengthened across all Country Programmes by acknowledging and reinforcing their role as the main convener and representatives of local authorities’ issues and interests. In Vietnam, this occurred through the provision of direct funding to the Association of Viet Nam Cities (ACVN) to manage and execute development projects in cities. In Uganda, the Urban Authorities Association of Uganda (UAAU) has been working in close collaboration with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) to provide training on municipal leadership to local governments, as well as developing a gap analysis assessment and implementation plan to strengthen itself. The targeted municipalities of the Burkina Faso Country Programme have been trained through an approach designed to also strengthen the institutional capacity of the Association of Municipalities of Burkina Faso (AMBF). In Mozambique, GIZ has been delivering technical assistance to support the National Association of Mozambican Cities (ANAMM) in its advocacy towards effective urban development and the Ministry of State Administration and Civil Service in leading the preparation of the National Urban Forum.

Educational institutions have also been brought on board such as Makerere University in Uganda, which has played a key role in carrying out research recommended by the National Urban Forum; this research has in turn fed into the drafting of the National Urban Policy for Uganda.

Finally, some significant examples of activities for networking and exchange include the National Urban Forum in all Country Programmes; the Annual Saver’s Convention in Vietnam; the participation of local organisations and government officials at international urban events such as WUF, Africities, Habitat III PrepComs and GIZ Sector Day; and south-south learning exchanges such as that between Ghana and Brazil.


††† Data for Ghana, Uganda and Vietnam; still tracking for Burkina Faso and Mozambique.
### Outputs Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.1 Partnerships convened for strategic country, regional and global priorities</td>
<td>Number of TA agreements endorsed by the partners per year</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2 Technical Assistance (TA) activities approved, approved and supervised</td>
<td>Total value of TA agreements approved</td>
<td>US$ (000)</td>
<td>8,081</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>7,132</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3 Cities Alliance knowledge products and policy dialogues delivered to targeted audiences</td>
<td>Audience access to knowledge products</td>
<td>Unique Visitor Access</td>
<td>36,656</td>
<td>69,830</td>
<td>78,881</td>
<td>23,874</td>
<td>73,845</td>
<td>76,520</td>
<td>76,530</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Secretariat Outputs**

**TIER IV: METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS**

Tier IV, the Secretariat level, is under constant tracking and regularly updated through the information gathered by the Cities Alliance project database. While overall the Secretariat’s performance has exceeded most of the performance expectations and annual targets, data on grant processing time is still not in line with the performance standards. The high number of days is due to a combination of internal non-optimised processes, grantee degree of responsiveness, and allocation of time. Cognisant of the challenge, in 2016, the Secretariat identified and put in place significant measures to increase internal efficiency. While the trend is already showing a positive sign compared to the previous years, it is expected that the benefits of these reforms will become fully visible only in the figures for 2017.

For indicator IV.4.1, data used for calculation include Projects which Project Proposals have been approved within the timeframe of a given calendar year (1 January – 31 December). For indicator IV.4.2, data used for calculations include Projects which project related grant agreements have been countersigned within a given calendar year (1 January – 31 December). For indicator IV.4.3, data includes projects for which the first disbursements were made in a given calendar year (1 January – 31 December).

We have added new key performance indicators at the Secretariat level (Tier IV) to cover three important corporate areas which were not previously captured: Our environmental footprint, progress on gender mainstreaming (a pillar of the Medium-Term Strategy), and ability to deliver against the corporate work plan. Please see note below on the GHG emissions target.

---

**NOTES TIER IV: METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS**

**Tier IV** refers to the Secretariat level, which is under constant tracking and regularly updated through the information gathered by the Cities Alliance project database. While overall the Secretariat’s performance has exceeded most of the performance expectations and annual targets, data on grant processing time is still not in line with the performance standards. The high number of days is due to a combination of internal non-optimised processes, grantee degree of responsiveness, and allocation of time. Cognisant of the challenge, in 2016, the Secretariat identified and put in place significant measures to increase internal efficiency. While the trend is already showing a positive sign compared to the previous years, it is expected that the benefits of these reforms will become fully visible only in the figures for 2017.

For indicator IV.4.1, data used for calculation include Projects which Project Proposals have been approved within the timeframe of a given calendar year (1 January – 31 December). For indicator IV.4.2, data used for calculations include Projects which project related grant agreements have been countersigned within a given calendar year (1 January – 31 December). For indicator IV.4.3, data includes projects for which the first disbursements were made in a given calendar year (1 January – 31 December).

We have added new key performance indicators at the Secretariat level (Tier IV) to cover three important corporate areas which were not previously captured: Our environmental footprint, progress on gender mainstreaming (a pillar of the Medium-Term Strategy), and ability to deliver against the corporate work plan. Please see note below on the GHG emissions target.
I.1. IMPROVED QUALITY OF LIFE, SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITION AND INCLUSION OF THE URBAN POOR.

I.1.1 Percentage of city population living in slums.

The number of people living in slums of a city (numerator) divided by the total population of this city (denominator) expressed as a percentage. At the country level, this percentage is the total number of people living in slums of all the cities of a country (the numerator), divided by the total population living in all the cities of the given country (the denominator), expressed as a percentage.


UN-Habitat has developed a household-level definition of a slum household to use existing household level surveys and censuses to identify slum dwellers among the urban population. A slum household is a household that lacks any one of the following five elements:

- Access to improved water (access to sufficient amount of water for family use, at an affordable price, available to household members without being subject to extreme effort);
- Access to improved sanitation (access to an engine and 2012.
- Sufficient living area (not more than two people sharing the same room);
- Security of tenure (evidence of documentation that can be used as proof of secure tenure status or when there is either de facto or perceived protection against forced evictions);
- Durability of housing (permanent and adequate structure in non-hazardous location);
- Sufficient living area (not more than two people sharing the same room).

Source: UN-Habitat

I.1.2 Percentage of households in urban areas that exist without secure tenure.

The number of households in urban areas without secure tenure (the numerator) divided by the total number of households in the same urban areas (denominator) expressed as a percentage. Secure tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection against forced evictions. People have secure tenure when there is evidence of documentation that can be used as proof of secure tenure status or when there is either de facto or perceived protection against forced evictions.


I.1.3 Under age 5 mortality rate in urban areas.

(Strategy-related) The under-5 mortality, also called infant mortality, is a rate defined as the number of infants dying before reaching their fifth birthday per 1,000 live births in a given year. It is an indicator of the Millennium Development Goals, which seek to reduce the under-5 mortality rate by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015. Under-5 mortality measures child survival and reflects the impact of social, economic, and environmental circumstances as well as other causes of death on infants, toddlers, and young children, including access to health care.


I.1.4 Participation of urban poor in the voting population.

The total number of voting urban poor per 1,000 voting persons. This definition refers to the concept of voting age population, which includes all citizens above the legal voting age.

Source: IDEA

I.1.1 Municipal expenditures per person per year [Effective Local Government].

Denominator: total population (estimated) of municipality in same year. Average expressed in US$.

Source: Operating budget of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1. Municipal employees per 1,000 inhabitants [Effective Local Government].

Numerator: Number of employees directly or indirectly employed by the municipality in a given year. Denominator: Total number of employees directly or indirectly employed by the municipality in the same year. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Human Resources Department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.5 Voter participation in most recent municipal election (as % of eligible voters) [Active Citizenship].

Numerator: Number of eligible voters who voted in most recent municipal election. Denominator: Number of eligible (or registered) voters in municipality for the same election. Figure expressed as an average. Sources: GCIF; voting records

II.1.6 Average percentage of women voter participation [Active Citizenship].

Numerator: Number of eligible female adult voters who voted in most recent municipal election. Denominator: Number of eligible (or registered) female voters in municipality for the same election. Source: Voting records

TIER II: CITIES ALLIANCE PROGRAMME OUTCOME

II.1. CITIES INCREASINGLY CHARACTERISED BY EFFECTIVE LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP, AND DELIVERING IMPROVED AND RESPONSIVE SERVICES TO THE URBAN POOR.

II.1.1 Municipal expenditures per person per year [Effective Local Government].

Numerator: Total operating expenditures of municipality in a given year.

Denominator: Total number of employees directly or indirectly employed by the municipality in the same year. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Human Resources department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.4 Proportion of municipal employees with post-secondary education [Effective Local Government].

Numerator: Number of well-trained employees (engineers, technical experts, etc.) in a municipality in a given year. Denominator: Total number of employees directly or indirectly employed by the municipality in the same year. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Human Resources department of municipality; national population census and population estimates.

II.1.5 Voter participation in most recent municipal election (as % of eligible voters) [Active Citizenship].

Numerator: Number of eligible voters who voted in most recent municipal election. Denominator: Number of eligible (or registered) voters in municipality for the same election. Figure expressed as an average. Sources: GCIF; voting records

II.1.6 Average percentage of women voter participation [Active Citizenship].

Numerator: Number of eligible female adult voters who voted in most recent municipal election. Denominator: Number of eligible (or registered) female voters in municipality for the same election. Source: Voting records
II.1.7 Existence of active municipal website for citizen questions and complaints [Active Citizenship].

Indicators measure existence and quality of the municipal ICT enhancing public accountability towards citizens.

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No website or equivalent ICT system</th>
<th>Website (or equivalent ICT system) exists and some information available but is not maintained/interactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City IT Departments.

II.1.8 Functioning of local-level governance structures for consultation, at ward or sub-ward level [Active Citizenship].

Consultation is a process through which subjects or topics of interest are discussed within or across constituency groups. It is a deliberation, discussion, and dialogue. The objective of a consultation is to seek information, advice and opinion. In any consultative process, the convener is not only gathering input, but sharing information as well. The organiser seeks to identify and clarify interests at stake, with the ultimate aim of developing a well-informed strategy or project that has a good chance of being supported and implemented. Providing and sharing information is seen as the foundation of an effective consultation process (World Bank).

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little or no participatory planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Information from website and/or operating budget; data from municipal administration.

II.1.9 Participatory planning processes in place (budgetary or other) [Active Citizenship].

Participatory planning is a tool for identifying the collective needs of all individuals within a community.

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little or no participatory planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City IT Departments.

II.1.10 Level of civil society activity in municipality [Active Citizenship].

The term civil society refers to the wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organisations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) therefore refer to a wide array of organisations: community groups, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), labour unions, indigenous groups, charitable organisations, faith-based organisations, professional associations, and foundations (World Bank).

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little or no civil society activity</th>
<th>Moderate civil society activity</th>
<th>Strong and visible civil society activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Cities Alliance Secretariat, Civil Society Index.

II.1.11 Access to regular potable water in slum and/or low-income areas [Delivering services to the urban poor].

Access: within 200 metres from a home; Adequate: 20 litres / day / person; Safe: water does not contain biological or chemical agents directly detrimental to health. Numerator: total number of households in slum and/or low-income areas with regular supply of potable water from municipal source (calculation based on MDG criteria). Denominator: total number of households living in slum and/or low-income areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little or no reference to city and urban themes</th>
<th>Representation of urban and city themes</th>
<th>Urban and city agenda considered as a corporate priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City Engineer’s office/Municipal Public Works Departments.

II.1.12 Kilometres of maintained roads in slum and/or low-income areas [Delivering services to the urban poor].

Numerator: Total number of kilometres of maintained roads in slum and/or low-income areas. [Imply that roads are graded regularly, there are culverts or runoff drains for the rainy season, and roads are passable for vehicles such as ambulances, taxis, and trucks for access to markets.] Denominator: Total number of kilometres of roads/patns in slum and/or low-income areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal sanitation departments.

II.1.13 Proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with sewerage connections [Delivering services to the urban poor].

Numerator: Total number of households living in slum and/or low-income areas that are connected to a main sewerage system in a given country. Denominator: Total number of households living in slum and/or low-income areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal water/sanitation departments.

II.1.14 Proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with regular electricity connections [Delivering services to the urban poor].

Numerator: Total number of households living in slum and/or low-income areas that are formally connected to electricity. Denominator: total number of households living in slum and/or low-income areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal/local electricity supply agency.

II.1.15 Proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas served by regular solid waste collection (either publicly or privately) [Delivering services to the urban poor].

Numerator: Total number of households located in slum and/or low-income areas that are served by regular solid waste collection (either publicly or privately). Denominator: Total number of households located in slum and/or low-income areas. Figure expressed as a percentage.

Sources: Municipal sanitation departments.
Tier III: Cities Alliance Intermediate Outcomes

III.1. NATIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORKS DEVELOPED AND/OR ENHANCED TO ADDRESS URBAN DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

III.1.1 (a and b in the Indicators Scorecard) Status of national urban policy (ies).

Indicators rates the status of national urban development policy(ies) in countries where the Cities Alliance works. National policies on urban development may include sectoral policies covering some or all the following aspects: housing, slum upgrading, transport, land, fiscal decentralisation. Policies are officially adopted through ministerial decree or pertinent legal declaration (must have legal status and budgetary commitment).

Rating scale - status of urban development policy in a given country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Policy not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy adopted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Copies of the official policies; member and Secretariat ratings

III.1.2 Status of development of national urban policy frameworks.

The rating scale measures the development of an urban policy framework in countries where the Cities Alliance works by measuring the qualitative evolution from single sectoral policies related to urban issues, to an integrated and comprehensive framework for city planning and governance. Characteristics of national policy frameworks include: (a) long-term strategic vision of cities; (b) creation of an enabling legal and fiscal environment; and (c) integrated and comprehensive approach to urban planning.

Rating scale: Comprehensive and integrated policy framework developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Policy not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single sectoral policy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sectoral policies developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comprehensive and integrated policy framework developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Copies of the official policies; members and Secretariat ratings

III.2 LOCAL PRO-POOR AND CLIMATE-RESILIENT STRATEGIES AND PLANS DEVELOPED, AND RESOURCES MOBILISED

III.2.1 Number of local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies/plans.

The indicator measures the number of local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies/plans developed in cities in which Cities Alliance works in a given year. Local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies may be city development strategies (CDSs), slum upgrading strategies, or other local strategies that include pro-poor and climate resilient elements.

Rating scale - number of local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies/plans in a given country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No strategy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strategy adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategy adopted and implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Copies of the CDSs, slum upgrading strategies, and Secretariat records

III.2.2 Total financial resources mobilised by partners for strategy implementation.

The indicator measures a) Total value (US$) of resources committed (budget) by the city for implementation of strategies and plans in a given year; (b) Total funding leveraged - Total value (US$) of resources committed by partners for implementation of strategies and plans per year; and (c) Average funding per $ of seed capital (grants) per year.

Sources: Completion reports; feedback; and Secretariat records

III.3 MECHANISMS TO ENGAGE CITIZENS IN CITY/URBAN GOVERNANCE DEVELOPED

III.3.1 Cities (in Country Programmes) with regularly functioning governance mechanisms to engage citizens in urban governance developed.

This indicator rates the degree of participation by citizens, including slum dwellers, at the local level in the determination, approval and implementation of urban development strategies and policies, by cities in which the Cities Alliance works through Country Programmes. Governance mechanisms include: social accountability mechanisms, slum development committee, and municipal fora.

Rating scale: Social accountability mechanisms, slum development committee, and municipal fora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No mechanisms developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mechanism developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mechanism adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mechanism implemented and engaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Completion reports; feedback; and Secretariat records

III.3.2 Countries with regularly functioning governance mechanisms to engage citizens in urban governance developed.

This indicator rates the degree of participation by citizens, including slum dwellers, at the national level in the determination, approval and implementation of urban development strategies by country in which the Cities Alliance works. Governance mechanisms include: national forum, city federation, association of municipalities.

III.3.3 Sustainability of mechanisms to engage citizens (all grants at city level).

This indicator rates the presence of mechanisms for participatory local governance in Cities Alliance activities at the city level and their sustainability beyond the project life cycle. Mechanisms include: social accountability activities, local fora, citizenship advocacy and awareness campaigns, grassroots NGO and community involvement.

Rating scale: mechanisms to engage citizens (all grants at city level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No mechanisms sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mechanisms sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mechanisms sustained and actively engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mechanisms sustained and actively engaged beyond project life cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Completion reports; feedback; and Secretariat records

III.4. CAPACITIES OF CITIES IN GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT STRENGTHENED.

III.4.1 Capacity of local governments in areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management.

This indicator rates the degree of capacity strengthened in the cities in which Cities Alliance works (through the Country Programmes and the Catalytic Fund) including
the capacity of local government authorities (in areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management).

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No capacity strengthening activities have been conducted by Cities Alliance partnership. Capacity of local government authorities has been strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Capacity development activities have been conducted, but strengthening is not yet evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capacity of local government authorities has been strengthened.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** CF progress and completion reports; CATF completion reports; member survey

**III.4.2 Capacity of training and support organisations (national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) to train local government officials and current and future urban technical experts.**

This indicator rates the degree of capacity strengthened in the countries in which Cities Alliance works (through the CPs and the Catalytic Fund) including the capacity of training and support organisations (national public organisations, universities, training institutions, associations of cities, etc.) to train local government officials and current and future urban technical experts (in strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management).

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No capacity development activities of training and support organisations have been conducted by the Cities Alliance partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Capacity development activities for training and support organisations have been conducted, but strengthening is not yet evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capacity of training and support organisations has been strengthened.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** CF progress and completion reports; member survey

**Tier IV: Cities Alliance Secretariat Outputs**

**IV.1. PARTNERSHIPS CONVENED FOR STRATEGIC COUNTRY, REGIONAL AND GLOBAL PRIORITIES.**

**IV.1.1 Multi-member partnership agreements endorsed by the partners per year.**

Indicator measures the number of formalised partnership agreements in a given year as a measure of the success of the Secretariat convening process. Partnership agreement may be: framework document for Country Programmes; resolution of partners; statement of agreement. Multi-member is defined as two or more Cities Alliance members.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

**IV.1.2 Scaling: Total financing for partnership agreements per year.**

Indicator measures total funding contributed in a given year to a specific partnership agreement by partners directly and/or jointly fundraised. It also calculates the value ratio of the total funds per Secretariat funding.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

**IV.1.3 Broadening: diversity of partners.**

This indicator measures the objective to diversify the membership base to other key stakeholders as well as expand financing mechanisms to local private sector. Categories of partners are: (i) Civil society/NGOs, academia; (ii) Private sector; (iii) Donors; and (iv) Local governments. 1

**Rating scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No non-member partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One category of non-member partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At least two categories of non-member partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three or more categories of non-member partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV.2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA) ACTIVITIES APPRAISED, APPROVED AND SUPERVISED.**

**IV.2.1 TA activities (CP, CATF and JWP) approved.**

Indicator measures the total number of TA activities [both grants and contracts] approved in a given year following the appraisal process. The appraisal process includes application of a checklist, according to specific guidelines, peer reviews and member reviews.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

**IV.2.2 Total value of TA activities (CP, CATF and JWP) approved.**

Indicator measures the total cumulative US$ value funded by the Cities Alliance of TA activities (both grants and contracts) approved in a given year following the appraisal process.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

**IV.2.3 TA activities supervised.**

Indicator measures quality of supervision. Percent of grants and contracts with progress and completion reports that include information on process and results achieved in a given year. Numerator: number of grants/contracts with at least 75% of all required progress and completion reports. Denominator: Total number of TA activities approved.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

**IV.3. KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS AND POLICY DIALOGUES DELIVERED TO TARGETED AUDIENCES.**

**IV.3.1 Knowledge products produced with grant financing by members and partners.**

Indicator measures the total number and cost of knowledge products developed with grant financing, as well as the alignment of the knowledge products and strategy, and demonstrates clear and proactive management of the delivery of Cities Alliance knowledge to targeted audiences.

Knowledge products may include: thematic publications, published diagnostic studies such as a State of the Cities Report (SOCR) or Urbanisation Review (UR); toolkits; and other guides, policy papers etc. produced by members and partners with Cities Alliance Secretariat support and funding. Generally, a knowledge product should have a Cities Alliance logo.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records; knowledge pipeline and distribution schedule

**IV.3.2 Knowledge products produced with grant financing by the Secretariat.**

Total number of knowledge products (see previous definition) produced with grant financing by the Secretariat.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

**IV.3.3 Knowledge products produced with grant financing and freely accessed by targeted audiences.**

Indicator measures the effective distribution of knowledge products via the Cities Alliance website (number of unique visitors to the CA website on specific knowledge pages/downloads from targeted countries). Total number of unique visitors to the CA website from targeted countries.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records

---

1 Sub-indicator to measure private sector engagement. Numerator: Number of instances private sector participates. Denominator: total number of partnering activities.
IV.3.4 Policy dialogues and formal learning events that are financed by grants and implemented by members and partners.

Indicator measures the total number of Policy Dialogues, Advocacy and Knowledge and Learning events that are financed by grants and carried out by member and partners. Policy dialogues may include: (i) formal consultation events with members and/or relevant institutions (e.g., decentralization talks in Tunisia; IBSA; Policy Advisory Forum); (ii) Advocacy/Communications events (e.g., seminars/workshops at Africities, WUF). Formal learning exchanges could include: peer-to-peer events and study tours, learning workshops and seminars.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.3.5 Policy dialogues and formal learning events that are financed by grants and implemented by the Secretariat.

Total number of policy dialogues and formal learning events (see previous definition) that are financed by grants and carried out by the Secretariat.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.4. EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT AND RESPONSIVE GOVERNANCE OF CITIES ALLIANCE DELIVERED.

IV.1 Average time for key phases in the project cycle – from initial submission of proposal to approval of grant.

Average time, in days, from initial submission of proposal to approval of grant for projects completing this phase in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.2 Average time for key phases in the project cycle – from approval of grant to grant agreement.

Average time, in days, from approval of grant to signature of grant agreement for projects whose agreement was signed in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.3 Average time for key phases in the project cycle – from grant agreement to first disbursement.

Average time, in days, from signature of grant agreement to first disbursement for projects receiving first disbursement in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.4 Average time for key phases in the project cycle – from first disbursement to closing.

Average time, in days, from first disbursement to closing for projects closed in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat records.

IV.5 Members’ impression of Secretariat effectiveness: support to governance meetings.

Average rating by members in a given year. Scale of five (1 – very unsatisfactory; 5 – very satisfactory) on rating selected statements.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat yearly survey of members.

IV.6 Members’ impression of Secretariat effectiveness: timeliness and quality of reports to members.

Average rating by members in a given year. Scale of five (1 – very unsatisfactory; 5 – very satisfactory) on rating selected statements.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat yearly survey of members.


Average emissions per Cities Alliance staff (tonnes CO2 equivalent) calculated on the following sources: Air travel, On-site Electricity, On-site Refrigerants, Public transport during official travel, Purchased heat/steam, CFC/HFCs.

Source: UNOPS GHG Annual Inventory as part of Greening the Blue initiative.

IV.8 Secretariat staff capacity on Gender Mainstreaming.

Average feedback rating by staff in a given year on selected statements evaluating workshops and other capacity development activities focused on gender.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat feedback and evaluation forms.

IV.9 Secretariat Delivery Performance.

Indicators measures the rate of completed activities against the approved annual work plan in a given year.

Source: Cities Alliance Secretariat Annual Work Plan reviews.
## ANNEX 2
### TIER III - INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES - 2016 SNAPSHOT

## TIER IV: SECRETARIAT OUTPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>DEFINITION/SUB-INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.1 National policy frameworks developed and/or enhanced to address urban development needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.1 Status of development of national policy(ies) related to urban needs [Rating scale (0-3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.2 Status of development of national urban policy frameworks [Rating scale (0-3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2 Local pro-poor and climate-resilient strategies and plans developed, and resources mobilised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.1 Number of local pro-poor climate resilient strategies/plans developed [RED - Strategy/plan not developed; YELLOW - Strategy/plan under development; GREEN - Strategy/plan development]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3 Mechanisms to engage citizens in city/urban governance developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3.1 Regularly functioning governance mechanisms at the city level to engage citizens in urban governance [Rating scale (0-3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3.2 Regularly functioning governance mechanisms at the national level to engage citizens in urban governance [Rating scale (0-3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4 Capacities of cities in governance and management strengthened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4.1 Capacity of local governments has been strengthened in areas such as strategic planning, financial management, and human resources management [Rating scale (0-3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4.2 Capacity of training and support organisations to train local government officials and current and future urban technical experts has been strengthened [Rating scale (0-3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>