**ANNEX E: CITIES ALLIANCE RESULTS FRAMEWORK AND INDICATORS (DRAFT - APRIL 2013)**

***Tier I***

*Development impact/MDG level*

**CA Programme Impact:**

Improved health, socio-economic condition and inclusion of the urban poor.

***Tier II***

***Cities*** *are responsible for results at this level. A Partnership of CA members cannot be held accountable for this; it can only support the achievement of these results in partnership with its beneficiaries and partners on the ground.*

**CA Programme Outcome:**

Cities increasingly characterized by effective local government, active citizenship, and delivering improved and responsive services to the urban poor.

**Intermediate Outcome 3:**

Mechanisms to engage citizens in city/urban governance developed.

**Intermediate Outcome 2:**

Local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies and plans developed, and resources mobilized.

**Intermediate Outcome 1:**

National policy frameworks developed and/or enhanced to address urban development needs.

***Tier III***

***The partnership of Cities Alliance Members*** *is responsible and accountable for delivering these outputs (which are intermediate outcomes from the Secretariat’s perspective). It is the partnership TOR.*

**Intermediate Outcome 4:**

Capacities of cities in governance and management strengthened.

***Tier IV***

***The Secretariat*** *is responsible and accountable for delivering these outputs. It is the Secretariat TOR.*

*It does so through its four* ***Business Lines:*** *(1) Country Programmes; (2) Catalytic Fund; (3) Comms and Advocacy; (4) Knowledge Products*

**Secretariat Output 4:**

Effective management and responsive governance of Cities Alliance delivered.

**Secretariat Output 3:**

Cities Alliance knowledge products and policy dialogues delivered to targeted audiences.

**Secretariat Output 2:**

Technical Assistance (TA) Grants appraised, approved and supervised.

**Secretariat Output 1:**

Partnerships convened for strategic country, regional and global priorities.

**TIER IV – SECRETARIAT OUTPUTS - INDICATORS**

|  |
| --- |
| **IV.1 Partnerships convened for strategic country, regional and global priorities.** |
| * Total Number of multi-member partnership agreements endorsed per year. * Total financing by partners and specific funds raised for partnership agreements per year.   + Total Value (US$)   + Ratio of $ per dollar of Secretariat funding * Diversity of partners |
| **IV.2 Technical Assistance Grants appraised, approved and supervised.** |
| * Total number of grant proposals appraised and approved per year. * Total value (US$) of TA grants approved per year. * Quality of supervision. |
| **IV.3 Knowledge products and policy dialogues delivered to targeted audiences.** |
| * Knowledge products produced with grant financing by (a) members and partners and (b) by the Secretariat.   + Total #   + Total Value (US$) * Knowledge products produced with grant financing and freely accessed by targeted audiences.   + Total Number of unique visitors to the CA website per year * Policy dialogues and formal learning events that are financed by grants and carry out by: (a) members and partners and (b) by the Secretariat.   + Total #   + Total Value (US$) |
| **IV.4 Effective management and responsive governance of Cities Alliance delivered.** |
| * Average time for key phases in the project cycle:   + From initial submission of proposal to approval of grant   + From approval of grant to grant agreement   + From grant agreement to first disbursement   + From final disbursement to closing * Members’ ratings of Secretariat’s effectiveness:   + Support to governance meetings   + Timeliness of reports to members |

**TIER III – INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES - INDICATORS**

|  |
| --- |
| **III.1 National policy frameworks developed and/or enhanced to address urban development needs.** |
| * National urban development policy frameworks adopted.   + Total # of urban policies by Country   + Status of the policy (Rating scale)   + Comprehensiveness of the policy (Rating scale) |
| **III.2 Local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies and plans developed, and resources mobilized.** |
| * Total number of local pro-poor and climate resilient strategies/plans developed per year. * Total financial resources mobilized by partners for strategy implementation.   + Total value (US$) of resources committed (budget) by the city for implementation   + Total value (US$) of resources committed by partners for implementation   + Average funding per $ of seed capital (grants) per year |
| **III.3 Mechanisms to engage citizens in city/urban governance developed.** |
| * How effectively the Country Programme has incorporated mechanisms of citizen engagement at community, municipal and national levels (Rating scale). * How effectively grants financed through the CATF have sustainable mechanisms for stakeholder engagement (Rating scale). |
| **III.4 Capacities of cities in governance and management strengthened.** |
| * Degree of capacity strengthened of local government authorities (Rating scale). * Degree of capacity strengthened of training organizations (Rating scale). |

**TIER II – OUTCOMES - INDICATORS**

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Cities increasingly characterized by effective local government, active citizenship, and delivering improved and responsive services to the urban poor** |
| ***II.1 Effective Local Government***   * Municipal expenditures per person (based on total city population) per year. * Municipal employees per person (based on total city population). * Proportion of municipal employees with post-secondary education. |
| ***II.2 Active Citizenship***   * Voter participation in most recent municipal election (as % of eligible voters). * Existence of active municipal website for citizen questions and complaints. * Functioning of local-level consultation structures, at ward or sub-ward level. * Participatory planning process in place (budgetary or other). * Level of civil society activity in municipality |
| ***II.3 Delivering improved and responsive services to the urban poor***   * Access to potable water in slum and/or low-income areas. * Kilometers of maintained roads in slum and/or low-income areas. * Proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with sewerage connections. * Proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas with electricity connections. * Proportion of households in slum and/or low-income areas served by regular solid waste collection (either publicly or privately). |
| ***II.4 Effectiveness of advocacy and knowledge product dissemination***   * Official Development Assistance for urban development. |

**TIER I – IMPACT – INDICATORS**

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Improved health, socio-economic condition and inclusion of the urban poor.** |
| * I.1 % of city population living in slums. * I.2 % of households in urban areas that exist without secure tenure. * I.3 Under age 5 mortality rate in urban areas. * I.4 Increase in participation of urban poor in voting population. |