



## IDENTIFICATION OF BEST PRACTICES, POLICIES AND ENABLING LEGISLATION IN THE LOCAL DELIVERY OF BASIC URBAN SERVICES (PHASE 2): END-OF-PROJECT EVALUATION





**Identification of Best Practices,  
Policies and Enabling Legislation  
in the Local Delivery of Basic  
Urban Services (Phase 2):  
End-of-Project Evaluation**

AUGUST 2015

UN  HABITAT

## Evaluation Report 1/2015

Identification of Best Practices, Policies and Enabling Legislation in the Local Delivery of Basic Urban Services  
(Phase 2): End-of-Project Evaluation

This report is available from <http://www.unhabitat.org/evaluation>

First published in Nairobi in August 2015 by UN-Habitat.  
Copyright © United Nations Human Settlements Programme 2015

Produced by the Evaluation Unit

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)  
P. O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi GPO KENYA  
Tel: +254-020-7623120 (Central Office)  
[www.unhabitat.org](http://www.unhabitat.org)

## DISCLAIMER

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, the United Nations, or its Member States.

Excerpts may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated.

## Acknowledgements

Author: Hugo Navajas  
Layout: Phyllis Githua  
Cover Photo: Diana Lopez

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Overview	1
1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation	1
1.3 Methodological Approach and Limitations	2
<b>2. FINDINGS ON RELEVANCE</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Preliminary Considerations	6
3.2 Achievement of Outputs, Results and Outcomes by Project Component	6
3.3 Project Ownership in Relation to Local Contexts and Beneficiary Needs	12
<b>4. FINDINGS ON EFFICIENCY</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5. FINDINGS ON IMPACT OUTLOOK</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. FINDINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>7. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>8. LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>9. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>26</b>
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	27
Annex 2: Persons Interviewed	34
Annex 3: Bibliography	35
Annex 4: Evaluation Questions Matrix	36



## LIST OF BOXES, FIGURES AND TABLES

Box 3.1	Project Component 1.....	6
Box 3.2	Project Component 2.....	8
Box 3.3	Project Component 3.....	9
Box 3.4	Project Component 4.....	12
Figure 3.1	City-to-City Alliances: Participating Local Governments from LAC and Spain .....	10
Figure 3.2	Main Outputs by Thematic Area: .....	11
Table 7.1	Evaluation Performance Ratings.....	20

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AECID	Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development
CGLU	United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DIBA	Delegation for the Province of Barcelona (and presidency of UCLG's Committee on Decentralization)
EU	European Union
FIAP	Foundation for Ibero-america and International Public Policies
FAMSI	Andalusian Fund of Municipalities for International Solidarity
FEMP	Spanish Federation of Municipalities and Provinces
GOLD III	Third Report of the Global Observatory on Local Democracy and Decentralization
Habitat III	UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development
HPM	Habitat Programme Manager
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean
MINAPS	Spanish Ministry for Public Administration
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTSIP	Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan
PAG	Program Advisory Group
PRC	Project Review Committee
PSUP	Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme
PrepCon	Preparatory Conference for Habitat III
ROAf	UN-Habitat's Regional Office for Africa
ROLAC	UN-Habitat's Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
USD	United States Dollar

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This evaluation analyzes the performance, achievements, contributing factors and lessons of “Identification of Best Practices, Policies and Enabling Legislation in the Local Delivery of Basic Urban Services (Phase 2)”, a global initiative that was implemented by UN-Habitat with funding from the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development (AECID). The evaluation was conducted between May and July 2015 and carried out following the evaluation norms and standards of the United Nation’s Systems; it combined the desk review of project documentation and skype interviews with project participants.
2. The project’s goal was to support local and national governments of selected countries in elaborating sustainable urban development priorities, with emphasis on urban governance, a more balanced distribution of responsibilities and resources, and better planning and efficiency by public administration. This was pursued through four project components that (i) supported decentralization processes and national urban policies, (ii) gave technical assistance for local government urban planning policies, (iii) provided decentralized city-to-city cooperation for municipal planning, and (iv) offered strategic and institutional support to Habitat III’s preparatory process through activities implemented from Spain. Most of the project activities took place in the Latin America & Caribbean region—Cuba, El Salvador, Colombia, Ecuador and Uruguay—in addition to Spain and Mozambique.
3. The evaluation found the project to have high relevance at different levels: Technical assistance and municipal cooperation were supportive of local government plans and recognized urban priorities. High level of local ownership found in several initiatives was an additional indicator of relevance. At a corporate level, project initiatives were supportive of UN-Habitat’s Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) and the advocacy mandate. They also had relevance to Spain’s international development cooperation priorities by focusing support on target countries and expanding the scope of municipal cooperation. The project was a catalyst of regional, national and (in particular) local initiatives that fed into broader processes such as Habitat III, GOLD III, or existing municipal programmes.
4. Project performance and achievement were satisfactory. Outputs were fully delivered and most of the planned results were achieved. Results and outcomes were reached to a large extent at the level of participating local governments and municipalities, with less effect on national urban policy or institutional capacities. This was influenced by the scale of intervention and limited follow-up to national and regional events. The project contributed to the regional preparatory process for Habitat III, disseminating information to a wider audience and supporting the reactivation of some National Habitat Committees. The decentralized technical assistance and city-to-city alliances have generated tangible results and local impact in several cases.
5. The progress made towards the immediate objectives corresponding to the four project components was satisfactory in terms of promoting decentralized technical cooperation (immediate objective 3) and strengthening the urban planning capacities of participating local governments (immediate objectives 1 and 2), and partially satisfactory in supporting the Habitat III preparatory process (immediate objective 4); however the project had little effect on national urban policies, as foreseen under the first objective.
6. Performance and impact levels were conditioned by project timelines and the scale of intervention. Enabling conditions for national urban policy dialogue were strengthened in participating countries under the first component. However, the project did not generate the continuity and momentum that was needed to influence national policies or build a regional consensus around Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda. The technical assistance and horizontal cooperation given to local governments have led to tangible impacts in several cases, i.e. improvements of urban infrastructure, approval of municipal ordinances and new programmes, and parallel donor financing on a larger scale.



7. The project was efficiently managed, and met the administrative/logistical challenges of servicing initiatives that were dispersed across various countries. Project components were decentralized in their administration, through UN-Habitat's Office of the Executive Director, to the Regional Offices of Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC) and Africa (ROAf – Mozambique), and the UN-Habitat Liaison office in Spain. Country-based Human Settlement Officers supported implementation in Mozambique, El Salvador, Ecuador and Colombia. The execution of component activities was delegated to Spanish and international partner organizations. Most outputs were achieved within the med timelines. Efficiency was reinforced by adaptive management, as reflected in the substantive revisions that were made to the project document by the Steering Committee and the periodic adjustments to work plans and deliverables through Annual Operative Plans. The few examples of inefficiency were related to the project's initial design (below expected standards), a slow start-up and delayed first disbursement, and the challenges of implementing city-to-city alliances within the approved timeframe. In the latter case, some alliances were unable to complete programmed cooperation activities and unspent funds were returned to the project budget.
8. Local participation and ownership were drivers of project efficiency. Technical assistance addressed urban plan priorities and were designed in consultation with local government. City-to-city alliances were driven by local governments on the basis of mutual interest. The high levels of local ownership found in some initiatives were another indicator of relevance; in Nampula (Mozambique) the residents of a marginal neighborhood selected the location for road construction. On a management level, the project Steering Committee assumed a decisive role in revising the project document and logical framework; this encouraged ownership at an early stage and improved the project's viability.
9. The project played an important catalytic role and most initiatives were designed to assist broader objectives and processes. As a result, their sustainability has largely depended on the outcomes of longer-term initiatives that are external to the project. The continuity of national/ regional dialogues and further engagement by National Habitat Committees will be determined by the overall Habitat III preparatory process and the role given to local governments. One year after the project's termination, there are indications of sustainability in two of the municipal alliances and at least one of the municipal initiatives, which is being replicated.
10. A third project phase was not considered due to the macroeconomic problems that have restricted Spanish funding and cooperation opportunities. However, the implementation approaches applied at the municipal level include several best practices that can be replicated in other local contexts. Likewise, the city-to-city alliances offer an innovative and potentially cost-effective option to standard project cooperation arrangements.
11. The project demonstrated UN-Habitat's ability to apply innovative urban planning and development approaches in diverse local contexts, disseminate best practices, and engage municipal actors at various levels. These are recognized strengths that enhance UN-Habitat's strategic positioning because they support corporate mandates and knowledge management, respond to local needs, and attract donor financing. The best practices derived from the project's implementation can be systematized and integrated within UN-Habitat's core cooperation modalities. Their potential contribution to the New Urban Agenda should be highlighted at Habitat III in order to encourage their replication on a larger scale. However, the lessons derived from the evaluation indicate a need to improve the design quality of project documents through better project appraisal and follow-up prior to approval. Likewise, the scope and depth of analysis for project monitoring and reporting should be expanded to assess factors affecting performance, and propose remedial actions when necessary.
12. This evaluation makes five recommendations. The recommendations are: (i) to ensure that projects meet expected design standards before they are signed; (ii) to build in an inception phase in the design of regional and global projects; (iii) to promote cooperation modalities that integrate innovative approaches to implementing; (iv) to replicate novel arrangement for municipal cooperation demonstrated by the city-to-city alliances; and (v) to define role of local governments in Habitat III.



# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

13. This evaluation analyses the performance, achievements, challenges faced and lessons learned of “Identification of Best Practices, Policies and Enabling Legislation in the Local Delivery of Basic Urban Services (Phase 2)”, a global project that was implemented by UN-Habitat with funding from the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID). The project was implemented between November 2011 and February 2014 (extended from May 2013) for a USD 3.404 million budget.
14. The stated goal of the project was to support local and national governments in selected countries in elaborating sustainable urban development priorities, with emphasis on urban governance, balanced distribution of responsibilities and resources, and public administration planning and efficiency. Participating countries and municipalities were selected in the LAC region (and Mozambique) with consideration of AECID’s cooperation priorities.
15. The immediate objectives of the project aimed to (i) strengthen local and regional government capacities on urban development and service management, contributing to national urban policies and global urban agendas; (ii) promote the articulating role of urban planning as an instrument for sustainable urban development; (iii) promote decentralized cooperation for sustainable urban development through technical assistance between cities; and (iv) support the Habitat III preparatory process, institutionally and strategically. The project was initially designed to follow up on a first phase of national dialogues and dissemination of best practices, implemented by the Best Practices Office in Barcelona, Spain and other UN-Habitat projects implemented in the Latin America and Caribbean region from 2008 to 2011. The approved project document underwent several revisions that resulted in the following four components:
  - Support to decentralization processes and the formulation of national urban policies in Latin America & the Caribbean.
  - Technical Assistance on Urban Planning Policies
  - Support for municipal planning through decentralized cooperation; and
  - Strategic and institutional support to the Habitat III process through activities implemented from Spain.
16. The project components were decentralized in their management to the UN-Habitat Regional Offices of Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC), to the Regional Office for Africa (ROAf – Mozambique) and the UN-Habitat office in Spain. Coordination functions were performed by the Office of the Executive Director and subsequently transferred to the Local Government and Decentralization Unit/Urban Legislation, Land and Governance Branch in May 2013. Component activities were executed in partnership with the Spanish Ministry of Public Administration (MINAPS), the Province of Barcelona, Spanish local government associations (FEMP, FAMSÍ), international municipal support/advocacy organizations (UCLG, FIAP, FLACMA) and Spanish local governments that offered direct cooperation to their LAC counterparts.

## 1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

17. UN-Habitat is undertaking this evaluation of the projects in order to assess to what extent the overall support and technical assistance of UN-Habitat has been relevant, efficient and effective, and sustainable. The evaluation aims to offer an objective assessment of the value-added, achievements, lessons, challenges and opportunities resulting from UN-Habitat’s support to the various project initiatives, that will inform UN-Habitat’s senior management, the Evaluation Unit and Regional Offices for Latin America & the

Caribbean (ROLAC) and Africa (ROAf), AECID and other project partners.

18. The main objective of the evaluation is to provide the agency, its governing bodies and donors with an independent and forward-looking appraisal of the agency's operational experience, achievements, opportunities and challenges. The evaluation will base its assessments on the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability in line with standards and norms of evaluation in the United Nations system. Evaluation findings are expected to help shape the focus of UN-Habitat in planning and programming projects, influencing strategies, replicating/up-scaling the implementation approach used, generating credible value for targeted beneficiaries, and addressing national priorities. The evaluation results will contribute to UN-Habitat's planning, reporting and accountability.
19. The evaluation is driven by the following specific objectives, as described in the Terms of Reference<sup>1</sup>: To assess progress made towards the achievement of results at the outcome and outputs level of the project;
  - To assess the relevance of UN-Habitat in promoting sustainable national, regional and urban development by focusing on best practices and lessons learned transfer;
  - To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects in achieving their expected results. This will entail analysis of delivery of actual outcomes against expected outcomes, in terms of delivery of outputs, achievement of outcomes and long term effects;
  - To assess the extent to which implementation approaches worked well and did not work that were enabling for UN-Habitat to define the results to be achieved, to effectively deliver projects and to report on the performance of UN-Habitat;
  - To assess the extent to which cross-cutting issues of gender and human rights in the design, planning and implementation, reporting and monitoring of the project;
20. The lessons drawn from the evaluation findings are expected to inform UN-Habitat corporate strategies and expand programming opportunities, as well as enhance collaboration with other UN agencies, international organizations and development partners. The evaluation should assist UN-Habitat in developing and replicating innovative project approaches, generating credible value for targeted beneficiaries and promoting further partnership with donors.
  - To bring forward programming opportunities that indicate potential for long-term partnership between UN-Habitat and local governments and their associations;
  - To make recommendations on what needs to be done to effectively promote and develop UN-Habitat's support to promote urban governance, decentralization and its impact on the delivery of basic urban services.

### 1.3 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND LIMITATIONS

21. The evaluation approach and methodology were detailed as per the Terms of Reference (Annex 1) and focused on key evaluation questions (Annex 4). The evaluation was managed by the Evaluation Unit, UN-Habitat and conducted by external consultant, Mr. Hugo Navajas. It took place between the months of May and July 2015, approximately one year following the project's finalization. The main advantages of conducting ex-post evaluations are that they enable a more reliable assessment of post-project sustainability and the appropriation of project-supported initiatives by partners and beneficiaries. At the same time, they offer insight into the achievement of results that require gestation periods to demonstrate effect (i.e. institutional capacity improvements) and therefore are not evident during the project term.
22. There are limits to institutional memory, however, particularly when project activities are centered on national or local governments that are affected by high levels of staff turnover as a result of electoral cycles. Data collection was restricted by these factors and in particular, the difficulties of arranging skype interviews or other communications with project participants (especially at municipal levels).

<sup>1</sup> The Terms of Reference are annexed to this report.

List of persons interviewed and bibliography are available in Annex 2 and 3. Because the evaluation budget did not allow for travel, the findings are largely based on the desk review and interviews with a reduced sample that leans more towards UN Habitat and executing partners; successive requests for interviews or written feedback were not responded by local government partners in LAC countries, or by representatives of the Spanish government. As a result, the findings of the evaluation are largely based on annual progress reports and the views of project managers, and less from the perspective of those who received assistance. One of the lessons that emerge from this is that project stakeholders need to be informed in advance of ex-post evaluations - and their memories refreshed - preferably by the donor or implementing agency.

23. Project reporting was essentially limited to descriptions of activities and outputs, and in the case of the final project report<sup>2</sup>, the achievement of results and outcomes. There is very little quantitative analysis, and no consideration of the factors—internal or external to the project—that affected project performance and achievement. As a result, the evaluation

analysis is qualitative and to a large extent descriptive. Because cross-component linkages and indicators were lacking in the project's design - and the four components were implemented as separate, "stand alone" projects—an over-arching assessment of project performance was not feasible and the analysis was focused on individual components.

24. Finally, the assessment of project effectiveness is influenced by manner in which the project was designed and revised following its approval. The signed project underwent major revisions that significantly altered its scale and content—expanding from two to eight and back to four components, with successive adjustments to results and deliverables. The signed project document and the revised version that guided actual implementation have very little in common. There is not a consistent baseline on which to measure levels of project achievement, which can be considered more or less satisfactory depending on the project document or annual report that is used for reference. For the purpose of the evaluation, assessments are based on the revised version of the project document (Spanish version) that was adjusted by AECID and the project Steering Committee.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Marco de Resultados, Conclusiones y Lecciones Aprendidas (no date)*

## 2. FINDINGS ON RELEVANCE

25. The project was relevant at different levels, supporting UN Habitat's global mandates and the needs of local government. Its objectives and implementation strategies were consistent with the 2008-2013 Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP), which was approved by UN-Habitat's Governing Council. The inclusion of sustainable urban development within the policy and legislative debate has contributed to MTSIP goals relating to advocacy, monitoring and partnership. Project initiatives such as national dialogues (Component 1), decentralized technical support to municipal governments (Component 2) and city-to-city alliances (Component 3) were relevant to the Global Campaign on Sustainable Urbanization that is advocated by UN-Habitat. The support given for inclusive approaches to urban revitalization, municipal planning and service delivery has led to tangible results in several instances. As case studies, they validate innovative practices that can be replicated, enhancing UN-Habitat's knowledge management base.
26. The high levels of local ownership that were found in some of the municipal-based initiatives is another indicator of relevance. The horizontal cooperation implemented under the third project component was driven by municipal alliances on the basis of mutual agreement, and formalized with MoUs between partners. The road improvement project in Nampula, Mozambique was selected by residents of the informal Muhala settlement that surrounds part of the city center. It also addressed a local government priority by decongesting traffic circulation in downtown Nampula and improving cross-city access. The project's relevance was reflected in the support of the Mayor's office, which contributed funds and the use of heavy equipment.
27. The technical cooperation given to municipalities in Colombia, Ecuador and El Salvador under the second component also fit into a broader urban planning context, building on local government priorities and ongoing initiatives. In Colombia, the creation of the Central-South Caldas Metropolitan Area linking Manizales to neighboring municipalities was essential to enable area-based planning, capital investments and service delivery; and to leverage IDB financing for a proposed integrated metropolitan development project. Santa Ana's municipal government in El Salvador prioritized the historic restoration of its urban center to stimulate tourism and economic revitalization. The relevance of these initiatives to local contexts was reinforced through adaptive management: Work plans, timelines and deliverables were periodically updated and re-programmed by Annual Operative Plans (Planes Anuales Operativos) that were consulted with local partners.
28. The first and fourth components provided direct support to the preparatory process for the UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) that will take place in Quito, Ecuador in 2016. This global conference is expected to convene almost 200 national governments and a wide range of local governments, municipal support associations, civil society organizations and NGOs. The General Assembly convened Habitat III to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable urban development through the adoption of a New Urban Agenda that would have direct bearing on UN Habitat's work in coming years.
29. The support given to the Habitat III process was strategically relevant to UN-Habitat's mandate and agenda, given its central role and the expected impact of conference outcomes (the New Urban Agenda in particular) on UN-Habitat's global positioning and work in coming years. UN-Habitat has benefitted from the better regional preparedness and "roadmap" for Habitat III, while local government stakeholders have had additional opportunities to voice their priorities and have an effect on Habitat III outcomes. The national and regional meetings – and regional review of the Latin American chapter of the GOLD III report on basic urban services - informed local and national governments, and offered an emergent platform for building consensus on urban policy issues that has direct relevance to New Urban Agenda.

30. The fourth component was also relevant to UN-Habitat's strategic interests. The launching of a UN-Habitat Liaison Office in Spain and the assistance provided to Spanish government delegations at the 6th session of the World Urban Forum and other events, have consolidated UN-Habitat's relations with the Government of Spain, which was its largest donor at the time. Likewise, the project served Spain's development cooperation interests in selected countries and has enhanced the positioning of AECID, participating municipalities and partner organizations as providers

of technical cooperation in urban planning and sustainable urban development in the LAC region. The involvement of 16 Spanish municipalities and two local government associations with eight Latin American municipalities in city-to-city alliances, served to broaden the scope of Spain's municipal cooperation in an innovative and cost-effective manner.

## 3. FINDINGS ON EFFECTIVENESS

### 3.1 PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

31. The assessment of project effectiveness is influenced by factors particular to the project. The signed project underwent successive revisions that significantly altered its scale and content. The project was expanded from two to eight components and afterwards reduced to four during its first year. Several components were originally “stand alone” project proposals that were brought together under this project at the donor’s request.
32. Afterwards, AECID and the project Steering Committee reduced the number of components and integrated several results; these changes reduced the level of fragmentation and improved design. However, the juxtaposition of unrelated proposals that were added (and removed) at different stages encouraged a heterogeneous project that lacked cross-component linkages or an over-arching programmatic vision. In this respect, it was an “umbrella project” that was assembled to make full use of funding and cooperation opportunities. The assessment of effectiveness is therefore compartmentalized according to specific components, and not in relation to the overall project.
33. Another affecting factor is the lack of a consistent logical framework. Both the number and content of results and outputs vary between the different versions of the project document,

and were further revised by the project Steering Committee in the Annual Operative Plans (Planes Anuales Operativos) and project reports. While the evaluator considers that such revisions helped to sustain project relevance and focus efforts, the scale of activity and expectation was downscaled over the implementation period (without formalizing the changes in approved project revisions). As a result there is not a stable baseline on which to measure levels of achievement, which can be considered more or less satisfactory depending on the project document or annual report that is used for reference. For the purpose of this evaluation, the analysis is based on the final version of the project document and logical framework that was annexed to the final project report.

### 3.2 ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTPUTS, RESULTS AND OUTCOMES BY COMPONENT

34. There were moderately satisfactory levels of achievement for component 1 (Box 3.1). Planned outputs were delivered, yet the expected results and outcome were partially achieved due to the scale of intervention and limited follow-up to conferences and other events that represented the main deliverables. The component had catalytic value in its contributions to the regional preparatory process for Habitat III—disseminating information to a wider audience and activating

**Box 3.1: Component 1**

Focus	Outcome	Results:
Support to decentralization processes and the formulation of national urban policies in Latin America and the Caribbean.	Local and regional government capacities are strengthened in urban development themes and contribute to the strengthening of national urban policies, decentralization processes and the management of basic urban services; contributing to the definition and development of objectives for the national and global urban agendas.	1.1 Consensus at central and local policy levels towards Habitat III and possible outcomes in terms of State reform and distribution of responsibilities at different government levels. 1.2 Capacities generated among Latin American local governments through the analysis and exchange of norms, policies and best practices. 1.3 A Group of Ministers and High-Level Authorities on decentralization, local government and territorial policies is consolidated and able to remit policy proposals and contribute to the Habitat III preparatory process.



National Habitat Committees in Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador and Cuba<sup>3</sup>. Best practice case studies on sustainable urban development were at conferences and documented for distribution.

35. As a result, enabling conditions for dialogue and consensus building on urban policy issues were strengthened in these countries. However, project resources were insufficient to support the follow-up that was needed to move beyond individual events and build a “critical mass” of consensus on urban issues, improve capacities within central/local governments or influence national urban policies<sup>4</sup>. Likewise, the current status of Habitat III preparations and uncertainties concerning the role of local governments at the Conference appear to have affected the momentum of national dialogues and National Habitat Committees.
36. National Dialogues were planned for Peru and Uruguay (Result 1.1) under the revised project document but subsequently reduced to one country in the logical framework. Uruguay’s National Dialogue reviewed the current situation of local governments with emphasis on citizen participation and dialogue, and urban governance. In addition to national participants, local government representatives affiliated to the sub-regional Mercociudades network attended the event. Following the presentations and discussions, the meeting concluded that (i) municipalities need to be open and engage with local residents, (ii) there is an intrinsic relation between decentralization, democracy, civil society participation and multi-level governance, and (iii) competencies need to be defined between different levels of government to enable their relation<sup>5</sup>.
37. Similar meetings were held in Cuba, Ecuador, Colombia and El Salvador (Result 1.2) with national and regional attendance. Best practices were presented in plenary and documented for dissemination. At the Ecuador conference, best practices in urban development, planning and land use management were presented by local and central government participants; this event followed the National Dialogue that was held in 2011. In Colombia, ministers, mayors and urban planners from the Andean sub-region came together to discuss urban planning, regional integration and the New Urban Agenda; the best practice case studies presented at this conference were also published.
38. Additional regional events were held in El Salvador and Uruguay to review and validate the Latin American chapter of the third Governance and Local Democracy Report (GOLD III) on local basic services. Participants gave their views to the draft, highlighting (i) the sustained improvement in access to basic services across the region, (ii) recurrent deficits in basic service delivery to rural areas, (iii) the importance of local government in managing urban services and monitoring their delivery, (iv) increased levels of municipal cooperation on territorial and land use planning, and (v) the importance of public subsidies and local participation for sustainable urban development. These meetings allowed UCLG to socialize and validate the GOLD III draft report (an important input for Habitat III) with a wider audience.
39. The component also organized the first meeting of the regional Group of Ministers and Authorities on decentralization, local government and territorial policies (Result 1.3). This group was established following the Sustainable Cities Days conference at UN Headquarters (December 2013), which brought together ministers, mayors and municipal organizations from 22 LAC countries. It provides a vehicle for regional consultations and consensus on urban issues, and is expected to channel proposals to Habitat III.
40. The events and activities implemented by this component helped inform local governments in the region on Habitat III, identify urban policy issues and best practices that are relevant to the New Urban Agenda, and activate National Habitat Committees in support of Habitat III<sup>6</sup>. Committees were created (or re-activated) in Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador and Cuba, whereas Uruguay’s National Habitat Committee did not materialize, partially due to the limited involvement

3 *National Habitat Committees combine central government, civil society and private sector representatives, and are intended to identify urban challenges and contribute to national urban policies through debate and advisory support. In the context of Habitat III, the Committees are considered an important mechanism for enhancing UN-Habitat’s interaction with key Habitat Agenda Partners at the national level.*

4 *An exception was Ecuador, where national discussions and presentations of best practices contributed to the design of a proposed urban policy.*

5 *Informe de Actividades 2013-2014, pg.6*

6 *The establishment of National Habitat Committees was listed as a separate result (1.4) in the second project document and annual reports, yet integrated within Result 1.1. in the final project report.*

of central government in the National Dialogue<sup>7</sup>. The available information is insufficient to assess the functionality of the National Habitat Committees or Group of Ministers that were constituted by the project.

41. Neither are there indications that these events have had influence on national policies or legislation, with the exception of Ecuador where stakeholder discussions and best practices offered inputs for a proposed national urban policy) that was submitted to ministry authorities for consideration. In retrospect, the expectation that these events would have effects at national policy levels was unrealistic considering the levels of activity and follow-up. The assessment of the component's impact and cost-effectiveness will largely depend on the outcomes of Habitat III and extent to which regional priorities are reflected in the New Urban Agenda.
42. The effectiveness of the three projects implemented under component 2 (Box 3.2) was satisfactory, and very satisfactory in the case of Nampula's road construction project. They were implemented in very different municipal contexts; as case studies they have replication potential and offer inputs to the New Urban Agenda. The outputs, result and outcome were met, on the scale of three pilot municipal initiatives.
43. The road improvement project implemented in the Muhala settlement of Nampula city is perceived as a win-win situation that benefited all parties. This project was selected by local residents using a participatory planning method that was designed in Mozambique by the Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme. Residents participated in all stages of the project and assisted the relocation of families that were affected by the road's design. The one-kilometer stretch that was constructed opens an important route for traffic circulation across the city, which decongests the central area and addresses a recognized need. The Mayor's Office contributed cash to relocate affected families, who were provided with housing in another area. Project reports estimate that almost 40,000 residents benefited from the improved vehicular access, transport, commercial opportunities and expected follow-up improvements of water and electric services. Project activities were supportive of UN Habitat's Participatory Slum Upgrading project, and served to validate the participatory planning methodology it had designed.
44. The project was cost-effective because it assisted ongoing initiatives, received a strong local government commitment, and helped to leverage USD 50,000 from the municipal council, more than USD 200,000 in parallel funds from the U.S. Millennium Challenge Corporation/ Millennium Challenge Account for a bridge and other improvements. This contribution almost doubled the project budget. New improvements are planned next year by the Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme that will replicate the approach that was used, with a larger budget. This will ensure the completion of drainage canals for the new road, which were suspended by heavy rains.
45. Project activities in Colombia and El Salvador also supported broader urban planning and development goals. The Manizales and Santa Ana projects produced technical studies that guided decentralization and urban historic revitalization initiatives, and were intended to help local governments obtain financing on a larger scale from the Inter-American Bank (IDB). This arrangement was encouraged by UN-Habitat's partnership with IDB for the Emergent and Sustainable Cities Platform. In Manizales,

### Box 3.2: Component 2

Focus	Outcome	Results:
Technical Assistance on Urban Planning Policies.	Urban Planning and capacity building in urban planning are promoted and recognized as a key instrument for achieving sustainable urbanization and guaranteeing citizen access to basic urban services.	2.1 Successful implementation of urban growth planning piloted in three cities.

<sup>7</sup> According to interviews with project team members.

technical assistance was used to design an area-based planning framework that articulates five municipalities of Caldas province. This led to the establishment of a wider Metropolitan Area that foresees inter-municipal urban planning, service delivery and investments. The new process would be implemented by an integrated development project for the Center-South Caldas region with IDB funding. The project also prepared different scenarios of municipal integration, wrote proposals for institutional integration, and helped data collection and mapping. Many local institutions were involved in addition to Spanish municipal partners and ROLAC.

46. The Santa Ana project aimed to recuperate the historic city center as a vehicle for local development. It was designed to assist a local government initiative that also involved other stakeholders, and had the possibility of leveraging donor funding on a larger scale. The project gave technical assistance and shared best practices in legislation for urban historic preservation. This contributed to the design and adoption of a municipal ordinance and norms for development in Santa Ana's historic city center. The project also strengthened technical staff with training and exchanges; and raised municipal income through the use of better revenue collection systems. The project offers a case study on how to revitalize the urban historic patrimony using the Law of Territorial Land Use and Development that had been recently approved at the time of the project.
47. Component 3 was the project's most innovative component and possibly its most productive in terms of outputs (Box 3.3). Overall achievement levels were satisfactory, which merits recognition in view of the challenges of arranging cooperation

activities with 24 municipalities and institutional partners (Figure 3.1). The component's outputs, results and outcome were mostly achieved, although local development plans were not produced on the scale expected.<sup>8</sup> The slow start up and progress of the component prevented some of the city-to-city alliances from being fully implemented and there were unspent funds at the project's end.

48. Several of the alliances have improved municipal urban planning and technical capacities, contributing to local ordinances and programmes that in some cases have resulted in concrete actions. They demonstrate an innovative approach to technical cooperation that is based on horizontal networks of local governments driven by supply, demand and common interest. This can provide a more direct and cost-effective alternative to standard bilateral cooperation modalities. Two alliances (Tarija, Ciudad Delgado) of Latin American and Spanish local governments are still active and funded by the participants, more than one year after the project's termination.
49. Five alliances were implemented by the Spanish and LAC local governments that are listed in Figure 3.2. Cooperation was designed around five thematic areas that were identified through consultation and needs assessment:
- Integrated urban planning and management of urban historic centers
  - Sustainable urban circulation
  - Integrated solid/liquid waste management and access to potable water

**Box 3.3: Component 3**

Focus	Outcome	Results:
Support to municipal urban planning through decentralized cooperation.	Strengthened urban planning and cooperation relations between cities for advancing local urban and social development plans and territorial policies, through cooperation and exchanges between Latin American local governments and Spain's decentralized municipal cooperation.	1.1 Cooperation relations between cities. 1.2 Institutional learning and networks established between LAC and Spanish cities. 1.3 A Local government capacities are strengthened in urban planning.

8 Marco de Resultados, Lecciones Aprendidas y Conclusiones, pg. 4

FIGURE 3.1: CITY-TO-CITY ALLIANCES: PARTICIPATING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN AND SPAIN

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN	
Bolivia	Municipal Government of Cochabamba Municipal Government of Tarija
Colombia	Mayor's Office of Manizales
Cuba	Pinar del Rio Province
Ecuador	Mayor's Office of Cuenca
El Salvador	Mayor's Office of Santa Tecla Mayor's Office of Santa Ana Mayor's Office of Ciudad Delgado
SPAIN	
Andalucia	Local government (Ayuntamiento) of Córdoba Delegation of JaénFAMSI
Aragón	Local government of Zaragoza
Asturias	Local government of Avilés
Castilla y León	Local government of Palencia Local government of Valladolid
Castilla La Mancha	Local government of Azuqueca de Henares
Cataluña	Local government of Hospitalet de Llobregat Local government of Santa Coloma de Gramenet Local government of Sant Cugat del Vallés Fons Catalá
Madrid	Local government of Alcobendas Local government of Parla Local government of Rivas Vaciamadrid Local government of San Sebastián de los Reyes
Murcia	Local government of Murcia
País Vasco	Local government of Bilbao
Valencia	Local government of Valencia
Other Partner Organizations	FEMP FAMSI Restauradores Sin Fronteras INCIDEM

- Territorial planning and land use management
  - Citizen participation and planning for urban development
50. Delays affected the component's implementation, yet there was considerable momentum as reflected in the number of activities and outputs that were delivered: Four training courses for 7 cities, 7 international fellowships benefitting 15 cities and 23 municipal staff, 6 consultancies in support of technical studies and municipal plans, and 6 technical assistance missions involving 10 cities and 14 technical staff.
51. The horizontal cooperation has produced various benefits. Local government staff acquired technical knowledge and skills through training

workshops and in-service internships with Spanish local governments. The exposure and guidance provided has encouraged the design and adoption of municipal ordinances and programmes for urban historic preservation, public spaces and other topics. Personal and institutional links were established between participating municipalities and organizations that in some cases continue and are being expanded, i.e. Tarija, Bolivia. Urban issues that hadn't received sufficient attention or support were given a higher profile and in some cases acted on by local government. Cooperating Spanish ayuntamientos and partner organizations benefitted from the exposure, networking and cooperation opportunities offered, in addition to the recognition of being part of a global UN initiative.

FIGURE 3.2: MAIN OUTPUTS BY THEMATIC AREA, COMPONENT 3

THEMATIC AREA	MAIN OUTPUTS
Integrated urban planning and management of urban historic centers	Action Plan for the protection of the urban historic patrimony (Cuenca, Tarija, Manizales) Catalogue of protected urban patrimony (Tarija) Staff trained in restoration of historic structures (Tarija) Municipal cooperation agreement with Ministry of Tourism (Ciudad Delgado) Revitalization of the city center and green belt (Pinar del Rio) Plan rehabilitating boulevards, plazas and parks (Pinar del Rio) Bi-municipal agreement with the Ministry of Tourism, joint legal provisions and establishment of route for tourism (Ciudad Delgado, Santa Tecla)
Sustainable urban circulation	Environmentally-sound proposals for improving urban transport (Pinar del Rio) Alternative circulation routes contributing to the recuperation of public spaces (Cochabamba, Pinar del Rio, Cuenca) Investment in street signals and road improvement (Pinar del Rio) Support to creation of an Urban Management Office (Pinar del Rio)
Integrated solid/liquid waste management and access to potable water	Comprehensive analysis of solid/liquid waste management systems (Cochabamba, Manizales) Trained staff in municipal water department (Cochabamba) Design of model for solid/liquid waste collection and disposal, contributing to the leveraging of IDB funding for capital investment (Tarija)
Territorial planning and land use management	Protected area management plan (Bosque de Aranjuez), leading to the relocation of squatters (Tarija) Master plan for urban public spaces (Manizales) Recuperation of urban public spaces (Sta. Tecla, Ciudad Delgado) Urban land use plan and associated project (Cuenca) Local plans for urban-rural land use and development (Sta. Tecla, Ciudad Delgado)
Citizen participation and planning for urban development	Two communal plans for organizational strengthening and social policy implementation, based on public-private partnership (Manizales) Strategy for citizen and private sector participation in tourism development me (Sta. Tecla and Ciudad Delgado)

52. The component performed well in leveraging municipal funds and in-kind contributions from participating local governments, and by providing technical assistance has helped local governments resource mobilize efforts. An example is the assistance given to Tarija for technical studies for a new landfill site and waste disposal facilities, which are being used by the municipal government to obtain IDB financing.
53. The following outputs were highlighted in the final workshop report and provide an indication of this component's effectiveness:
54. The fourth component established UN-Habitat's presence in Spain and gave direct support to the national Habitat III preparatory process (Box 3.4). This served corporate objectives by strengthening

ties with the largest donor at that time. The opening of the country UN-Habitat liaison office enabled more consistent communications with the Spanish government at different levels (AECID, Ministry of Public Administrations, DIBA), municipal networks and support organizations (i.e. FEMP, FAMSÍ) and international organizations represented in Spain such UCLG. The country presence also helped to informing Spanish partners on Habitat III and UN-Habitat's approaches to sustainable urban development (Results 4.1, 4.2). The institutional arrangements that drove project execution were negotiated in advance of this component (in some cases carried over from the previous phase); however, the UN-Habitat office in Spain assisted the management and coordination of project activities with partner institutions (Result 4.4).

**Box 3.4: Component 4**

Focus	Outcome	Results:
Strategic and institutional support to the Habitat III process through activities implemented from Spain.	The Habitat III preparatory process is supported in coordination with the priorities of government institutions that are linked to UN-Habitat's mandate.	<p>4.1 The Habitat III preparatory process is supported and disseminated.</p> <p>4.2 UN-Habitat support services are disseminated and promoted among Spanish partners.</p> <p>4.3 Spanish best practices and case studies in sustainable urban development are disseminated nationally and internationally.</p> <p>4.4 Institutional alliances are promoted and strengthened.</p>

55. The component opened new windows of opportunity for Spanish municipal cooperation, raising the country's profile as a provider of technical assistance in urban planning and development in LAC. The Spanish delegation to the sixth session of the World Urban Forum (WUF6) (Naples, 2012) was assisted with networking events on sustainable urban development, decentralization and local public finance. Similar assistance was given to the Ministry of Development for the seventh session of the WUF (WUF7) (Medellin, 2014). According to the ROLAC Director, Latin America profited from WUF VII, which helped to mobilize support for Habitat III in the region. Best practices and case studies from Spain and the LAC region were drawn from the Cities for a Sustainable Future database and translated for Spain's National Habitat Committee. On the basis of these findings, the achievement of the outputs, results and outcome for this component was satisfactory.

### 3.3 PROJECT OWNERSHIP IN RELATION TO LOCAL CONTEXTS AND BENEFICIARY NEEDS

56. Ownership and effectiveness were intrinsically linked. High levels of local ownership aided the satisfactory performance described in the previous section. Ownership was essential to move project initiatives forward, and more so within given

timeframes and budgets. The implementation strategy applied by the second and third project components gave opportunities for local ownership that have helped sustain the project's relevance and local commitment. The road improvement project in Nampula (Component 2) was selected by local residents and at the same time supported a broader need for better circulation around the city center. The project encouraged high levels of ownership among Muhala residents who participated in the various project stages, worked on the road and helped relocate affected families, and with the Nampula Mayor's Office, which gave funds and loaned heavy equipment.

57. The city-to-city alliances of the third component were fully managed by local governments based on the supply and demand for technical assistance and mutual interest. This encouraged high levels of ownership as reflected in the outputs achieved and the allocation of municipal funds to co-finance the initiatives. Ownership was also assumed by the project Steering Committee (Comité de Pilotaje), whose members played an important role in revising the project document, adjusting work plans and approving annual work plans.

## 4. FINDINGS ON EFFICIENCY

58. This was a difficult project to manage in terms of its administrative, coordination and logistical demands. The four project components supported dispersed activities in different locations; many were time consuming and carried high servicing costs in relation to the expenditure involved. Much of the project's efforts went to organizing workshops and conferences, sending consultants and municipal resource persons on short missions, and processing disbursements for many activities.
59. Project start-up was slow. The project document was signed in August 2011 and the first disbursement made in November. Project activities did not start until January 2012 due to "internal administrative reasons."<sup>9</sup>. The initial delay was compensated by AECID's agreement to extend the project until February 2014.
60. The project was decentralized in its various components to the UN-Habitat Regional Office of Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC), the Regional Office for Africa (ROAf) and the UN-Habitat office in Spain. Coordination functions were performed by the Office of the Executive Director and subsequently transferred to the Local Government and Decentralization Unit, Urban Legislation, Land and Governance Branch in May 2013. A Human Settlements Officer based in ROLAC would provide oversight to country level implementation in the region. Country-based Habitat Programme Managers supported implementation in Mozambique, Cuba, Ecuador and Colombia, as did UN-Habitat's Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) in El Salvador. The UN-Habitat office in Spain liaised with the project Steering Committee and project partners. To improve delivery, the administrative and financial management of the third component was transferred to ROLAC in 2012. The feedback received indicates that this arrangement was satisfactory and disbursements were allocated on a timely basis, with the exception of the initial delays that affected the project's inception.
61. The project was efficiently managed and implemented. To a large extent this was due to adaptive management: The initial project document was below expected design standards and the recommendations of UN-Habitat's Program Advisory Group (PAG)<sup>10</sup> were not reflected in the final draft. However, subsequent revisions to the project's design by AECID and the Steering Committee – reducing the number of components and integrating results - were important to lower the project's fragmentation, improve clarity and raise its viability. Likewise, the delegation of responsibilities to executing partner organizations, combined with the periodic adjustments of work plans and deliverables through Annual Operative Plans (POA), were important to ensure overall efficiency. Another example of adaptive management was the decision to delegate the administrative/financial management of the third component to ROLAC in order to improve delivery.
62. Most outputs were delivered within their planned timeline. Interviewed country participants were positive in their assessment of UN-Habitat's responsiveness and efficiency, both from Nairobi and the Spanish liaison office. Project consultants hired by the Spanish office provided consistent management support and technical guidance to components under their responsibility. Several of the municipal initiatives that were implemented under the second and third components have helped to leverage additional financing from local governments and donors; in some cases these amounts exceeded the UN-Habitat contribution significantly. In almost all cases, outputs have contributed to the achievement of respective results and outcomes.
63. National and local contexts have also had direct bearing on efficiency levels. The presence of Habitat Programme Managers (HPMs) and parallel initiatives in Colombia, El Salvador, Ecuador and Mozambique offered a supportive base that

9 *Marco de Resultados, Lecciones Aprendidas y Conclusiones, pg. 5*

10 *The PAG replaces the Project Review Committee (PRC) that previously appraised project proposals.*

helped efficiency. ROLAC provided technical and administrative backstopping to LAC-based initiatives, particularly in the case of the third component; although the evaluator feels that ROLAC could have played a more substantive support role, it was represented on the Steering Committee. In Uruguay and El Salvador, regional and national conferences were scheduled “back-to-back” to facilitate logistics and lower total cost.

64. An exception to the generally satisfactory efficiency level was the third component, which was very slow in getting started. The complexities of engaging local governments from six countries with different administrative/legal regulations, capacity levels and political calendars required considerably more time than had been envisioned. Indeed, one of interviewed project managers recognized that the time needed to implement the city-to-city alliances had been underestimated in the component's design.

The final workshop report for this component noted that implementation “...was affected by accumulated delays from the beginning, as well as in the definition of ‘supply’ versus ‘demand’ and in managing consultancies”<sup>11</sup>. At a Steering Committee meeting, FEMP requested better coordination and clearer institutional roles for the third component. The combination of late starts and low delivery resulted in a balance of unspent budget at the project's end. The final workshop report acknowledged “important difficulties” in operations and management that led to the cancellation of activities, technical assistance missions and planned consultancies. These constraints were influenced by externalities outside the project's control and therefore cannot be directly attributed to UN-Habitat's performance or that of executing partners.

---

11 *Taller de Presentación y Balance de Resultados “Alianzas Ciudad-Ciudad, pp. 11-12*



## 5. FINDINGS ON IMPACT OUTLOOK

65. Expectations of impact need to be viewed in the context of a global project that was designed to last 18 months, and was implemented over a 2.5 year period (with extensions). The approved timelines were therefore limited in relation to the scale of activity and expected outcomes (particularly for the third component).
66. Overall project impact levels<sup>12</sup> were satisfactory at the municipal level, yet there was little effect on national urban policies or central government capacities. Most of the planned development results were achieved in the 11 municipalities from Latin America and Mozambique that participated in the project. Several local initiatives have led to the adoption of municipal ordinances, plans and policies. In a few cases there were concrete impacts as well: The construction of 1 kilometre of inner city road benefited 40,000 residents of Nampula's Muhala slum with improved urban access and transport, planned extensions of electricity and water services, and the leveraging of parallel financing for other investments. There were advances in infrastructure improvements, recuperation of public spaces and preservation of urban historic patrimony in Pinar del Rio, Cuba and Tarija, Bolivia. In Tarija, technical studies guided by Spanish municipal expertise are helping the local government to secure IDB funding for waste management infrastructure. Decentralized cooperation in Manizales (Colombia) and Santa Ana (El Salvador) have led to follow-up IDB technical support and financing. The municipal revenue collection system of Santa Ana was also improved (and presumably the amount of revenue collected as well) through project cooperation.
67. The city-to-city alliances demonstrated an innovative and cost-effective approach to municipal cooperation that was based on networking and horizontal cooperation. Local government technical capabilities and initiative were strengthened through in-service internships, technical assistance and municipal partnership. In at least two cases (Tarija, Bolivia and Ciudad Delgado, El Salvador) the alliances have continued beyond the project.
68. Development results were less evident at the national and regional level, partly due to the project's scale of activity and the focus on local government. One national dialogue and three regional conferences were held to promote Habitat III and build urban policy proposals for the New Urban Agenda. National Habitat Committees were activated in four LAC countries. These provided opportunities to expand dialogue and consensus around national and regional urban policy issues. Conference discussions and best practices reportedly contributed to the design of a proposed national urban policy in Ecuador. However, in most cases the level of engagement did not enable the continuity or momentum needed to move beyond individual events and influence national policy frameworks or institutional capacities. The present status of Habitat III's preparatory process and uncertainties on the role of local governments at the Conference, do not encourage continued national dialogue or deliberation on Habitat III.

<sup>12</sup> *Assessment based on the general and specific project objectives that are listed in the introductory chapter of this report.*

## 6. FINDINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

69. After its approval, the project encouraged high levels of stakeholder participation. The project Steering Committee played an important role in the project's oversight and adaptive management, proposing revisions to components and adjusting work plans. Spanish municipal associations and support organizations were represented on the Steering Committee, in addition to UCLG and UN-Habitat (including ROLAC). The Steering Committee meeting reports describe consultations and discussions on substantive issue that led to substantive revisions to the project's components. Several of the Steering Committee members were responsible for the execution of project components.
70. Implementation arrangements and work plans for municipal initiatives under the second and third project components were designed in consultation with local partners and beneficiaries, in some cases with inception workshops. The role of UN-Habitat, Spanish partners and UCLG tended towards facilitation rather than prescription. The decentralized cooperation provided to Colombia, El Salvador and Ecuador have assisted initiatives implemented by local governments with broad participation. Local partners were consulted during the review of work plans and deliverables for Annual Operative Plans.
71. There were very high levels of local government participation and ownership in the city-to-city alliances (Component 3) that were which approved with MoUs. The alliances were driven by municipal partnerships on the basis of shared interest and the supply/demand for technical assistance. High levels of local government ownership and responsibility raised the relevance and sustainability potential of several alliances. Two of the five alliances continue to function more than one year after the project's end, and are financed by local contributions on both sides.
72. Beneficiary involvement in project implementation and monitoring was satisfactory, particularly with municipal projects under the second and third components. The most outstanding example of beneficiary participation was offered by the Nampula project, which was prioritized and selected by local residents applying a participatory methodology that had been developed by another UN-Habitat project in Mozambique. The residents of the Muhala informal settlement participated in road construction and assisted the relocation of affected families. This relation preempted potential conflicts and generated short-term employment opportunities that raised local support for the project.
73. The first and fourth components followed a different dynamic and have to be assessed in a different light. They were event-driven and focused on the organization of national and regional conferences, and the documentation of best practices, in support of the Habitat III process. The events weren't intended to be sustainable per se and instead aimed to support broader processes. With the exception of Ecuador, they do not appear to have influenced national urban policy at national levels. Their sustainability (in terms of influencing longer-term policies and processes is uncertain at present and will depend on the outcomes of Habitat III and the expected New Urban Agenda.
74. These components encouraged participation by different levels of government. The regional reviews of the draft GOLD III chapter on Latin America included a wide range of local government representatives who contributed to its content. Ministers met in New York together with local government representatives to prepare for Habitat III. The national dialogue and formation of National Habitat Committees had the intention of encouraging country involvement in the Habitat III process, and specifically, to ensure the presence of local government in the preparations, as ultimate implementers of the future urban agenda.
75. Some of the implementation strategies and methodologies have a high replication value. The city-to-city alliances demonstrate an innovative approach that is based on networking and horizontal cooperation. By articulating groups

of local governments around thematic areas that are based on mutual interest and opportunity, the alliances encourage local ownership and commitment. The approach provides a cost-effective alternative to the standard “one on one” bilateral cooperation arrangements, and can be replicated with other countries. The participatory methodology used for the Nampula project will be used by the Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme to plan other urban improvements. The approaches that were used to organize national dialogues and habitat committees were adopted by UN Habitat and will be applied for updating decentralization strategies in Africa and the Asia-Pacific regions with funding by the Government of France. Most project activities were more closely aligned to local government plans than to national policies. In several cases they led to municipal ordinances and policies that enable the continuity of activities beyond the project term. The implementation approaches used by the project encouraged local ownership and commitment, which are key to promoting post-

project sustainability. The immediate challenge is to sustain institutional memory and practice beyond the electoral cycles and changes of local government authorities.

76. The project’s ability to leverage parallel funding has also contributed to continuity and replication. In Nampula, project activities leveraged financial contributions from the city government and parallel financing from the U.S. Millennium Challenge Account that practically doubles the project budget. The UN-Habitat Participatory Slum Upgrading Programme plans to invest close to USD 800,000 in urban improvement initiatives, applying the participatory methods validated by the Nampula project, and channeling funding from the EU, the municipality and the Government of Mozambique. In Tarija, the technical cooperation received has led to the creation of a municipal programme for the protection of urban historic patrimony, and produced technical studies that have assisted the municipal government in leveraging IDB funding for waste management and disposal infrastructure.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

77. The project's general level of effectiveness in achieving outputs and results was satisfactory for the four components, and highly satisfactory in some cases. Outcomes that were directed at local governments were reached to a large extent among the participating municipalities, while there was less progress towards outcomes affecting national urban policy and institutional capacities. A majority of the planned outputs and results were fully achieved. Project performance was aided by the relevance and catalytic value of several local initiatives that supported broader processes. Outcomes were more evident at municipal levels than national policy frameworks or central government institutions. The scale and continuity of project support did not enable the momentum needed to strengthen central government capacities or influence national urban policies.
78. Results were most visible in the municipal initiatives implemented under the second and third components. Technical assistance led to the approval of municipal ordinances, policies and programmes; and in some cases, concrete improvements in urban infrastructure and services. Inter-urban access was improved in Nampula, Mozambique and Pinar del Rio, Cuba. Road improvements in Nampula leveraged parallel donor funding that practically doubled the project budget. In Bolivia, a new municipal programme to preserve Tarija's urban historic patrimony is being implemented that includes physical restoration. Technical studies that were guided by Spanish partners are helping Tarija's municipal government to secure IDB financing for a new landfill and waste disposal facilities. An inter-municipal planning framework was designed for Manizales (Colombia) and five municipalities of Caldas province that foresees joint planning, investment and management of basic services. Project deliverables are also expected to leverage multi-lateral funding for integrated development and urban historic restoration in Manizales and Santa Ana (El Salvador). The mobilization of donor funds on this scale, once approved, would raise the level of effectiveness and impact significantly.
79. The results and outcomes of the first and fourth components are influenced by the broader Habitat III process that will culminate with the Conference in 2016. As a result, their achievement level cannot be reliably assessed at present. These components assisted Habitat III preparations by organizing national and regional events that presented best practices and offered opportunities to discuss urban policy issues and begin to build consensus. Most of the planned outputs were fully delivered by both components. Both components—and the project in general—have broadened international cooperation opportunities for local government partners and organizations, raising Spain's profile as a provider of technical assistance in urban planning and development.
80. The first component in particular supported Habitat III. The national dialogue held in Uruguay and other national/regional events opened opportunities for discussions on urban issues and proposals for the New Urban Agenda. Local government mayors, ministers and high-level authorities were brought together to begin building a regional platform for Habitat III. Case studies of urban best practice were presented and the Latin American chapter of the GOLD III report reviewed and validated. The fourth component consolidated UN-Habitat's presence in Spain by facilitating communication with national partners, assisting government presentations at the World Urban Forum and disseminating information on Habitat III and UN-Habitat's services.
81. The activities of both components contributed to longer-term processes that will culminate with Habitat III in 2016. For this reason, it may be premature to assess the achievement of results or outcomes that will be determined by the level of regional consensus that is reached and the influence this has on Habitat III's agenda and outcomes. Progress may be affected by the present status of the Habitat III process and uncertainties on the role of local governments at the Conference.

82. The project was implemented efficiently and most of the expected results were achieved in a cost-effective manner. This was a difficult project to manage in terms of its administrative, coordination and logistical demands. Project activities were dispersed in different regions, countries and municipalities; they were often time-consuming (for example, organizing regional conferences) or carried high servicing costs for short-term consultancies and country missions. Most project outputs were delivered in full and within the expected timelines.
83. Evaluation respondents were positive in their assessment of UN-Habitat's responsiveness and administrative efficiency. Efficiency was assisted by adaptive management and adjustments to work plans and deliverables in Annual Operative Plans. Local initiatives in Mozambique, Colombia and El Salvador benefitted from the presence of Habitat Programme Managers (HPMs), a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) in El Salvador, and ongoing UN-Habitat projects that provided on-the-ground assistance. The view of the evaluator (and concurring with workshop documentation) is that the decentralized cooperation and city-to-city alliances were more cost-effective than standard UN project arrangements in terms of expertise costs and overheads. The cost and logistics of organizing successive meetings were partly alleviated by the scheduling of back-to-back regional and national events in Uruguay and El Salvador.
84. Inefficiency was observed in the project's initial design and start-up, more than actual implementation. The project design process was poorly articulated and driven by immediate funding opportunities and deadlines; generating a rushed dynamic that was detrimental to the final product. The signed project document was below UN standards in terms of design quality, in spite of the observations made by UN-Habitat's Project Review Committee.<sup>13</sup> After approval, the project grew from two to eight components by incorporating project proposals that had been submitted separately to AECID for funding. The number of components was subsequently reduced to four after final revisions were made by the project Steering Committee. Although the project's design and clarity improved with the
- revisions, it remained an "umbrella" project of separate initiatives that were grouped together to make full use of funding opportunities.
85. Project start-up was slow and activities began five months after approval; this delay was compensated by an approved extension. The pace of the third project component was undermined by the difficulties of establishing alliances between local governments with differing administrative/legal requirements and political calendars. The component's administration and financial management were subsequently transferred to ROLAC in order to improve slow delivery. However, some activities could not be implemented in the remaining time and there were unspent funds at the end of the project.
86. The crosscutting issues of gender and human rights were not directly considered in the project's design, planning and implementation, reporting and monitoring. This is to be expected given the project's focus on urban development and local basic services. However, some project initiatives were indirectly relevant to these issues, by improving access to basic services in impoverished slum areas and providing channels for local participation in urban improvements (i.e. Nampula). The support provided to the Habitat III preparatory process may also indirectly contribute to the consideration of gender and human rights issues within the proposed New Urban Agenda.
87. The implementation approaches used to deliver results were well designed, effective, and compatible with local and global contexts. They have worked well in relation to the available time and resources that the project had. Many project initiatives were catalytic and built on existing UN Habitat and local government initiatives; in these cases the results have contributed to broader urban objectives and processes. Some approaches such as the city-to-city alliances were innovative and demand driven. Dialogue and ownership were encouraged in all components. The approaches used in the different components had aspects in common that are described below.<sup>14</sup>

13 Now known as the Program Advisory Group (PAG).

14 The conclusions respond to the evaluation's objectives and guiding questions as listed in the Terms of Reference.

88. A summary of the evaluation ratings given to the project is presented below (Table 7.1):

TABLE 7.1: Evaluation Performance Ratings

CRITERION	SUMMARY ASSESSMENT	RATING
<b>Relevance</b>	Project components were highly relevant to UN-Habitat's corporate mandates, local government priorities and preparations for Habitat III.	Highly Satisfactory (5)
<b>Effectiveness: Achievement of Outputs, Results and Outcomes</b>	Most planned outputs were fully achieved. Results and outcomes were largely achieved at municipal levels in pilot localities, yet there was limited effect on national urban policies and institutional capacities. The effectiveness of the support given to regional preparations for Habitat III was affected by the limited follow-up to events, and external issues affecting the broader Habitat III process.	Satisfactory (4)
<b>Efficiency</b>	Project efficiency was satisfactory considering the challenges of implementing a global project with dispersed activities and considerable servicing demands. Management and administrative arrangements were decentralized. Delays affected project inception and first disbursement; some city alliances that were not fully implemented. This was influenced by the underestimation of timelines for delivering results. The signed project document was flawed in its design. Efficiency was improved through adaptive management.	Satisfactory (4)
<b>Impact Outlook</b>	The level and depth of impact were influenced by the scale of activity and time allotted for implementation. There were localized impacts in selected pilot initiatives (i.e. Nampula) and city-to-city alliances. The project had greater effect in participating municipalities than at national policy/institutional levels.	Partially Satisfactory (3)
<b>Sustainability and Replication</b>	Project implementation strategies and institutional arrangement encouraged participation and high levels of local ownership at municipal levels. There are some indications of sustainability or replication resulting from the technical assistance provided under the second and the components. The national dialogue and other events supported by the first and fourth components were intended to assist Habitat III; hence their sustainability is unclear and will be largely determined by the broader preparatory process. A follow-up project is not under consideration, given Spain's recent macroeconomic problems.	Partially Satisfactory (3)
<b>OVERALL PROJECT RATING</b>	The project performed satisfactorily considering the available time and resources, and the catalytic role of many project activities.	Satisfactory (3.8)

## 8. LESSONS LEARNED

89. UN-Habitat is strategically positioned to systematize, disseminate and replicate new trends and best practices in sustainable urban development. The decentralized technical assistance and city-to-city alliances need to offer cost-effective alternatives to standard project modalities. UN-Habitat has demonstrated the ability to apply innovative urban planning and development approaches in diverse local contexts, disseminate best practices, and engage municipal actors at various levels. These are recognized strengths that are very relevant to UN-Habitat's strategic positioning and cooperation modalities, because they support corporate mandates and assist knowledge management, are responsive to local needs and attract donor financing. The technical assistance given to municipal initiatives were supportive of local government priorities and often fed into broader processes. Relevance was sustained through "country roadmaps" and annual operative plans that were adjusted in consultation with project partners and HPMs.
90. The implementation approaches used by the project included good practices that need to be replicated on a broader scale:
- Technical support resources and deliverables built on existing initiatives and local government priorities. This raised the catalytic effect of outputs that contributed to broader objectives and, in some cases, leveraged parallel donor financing.
  - Technical support was facilitative more than it was prescriptive. Participation was encouraged in the planning and delivery of project outputs. Technical assistance was designed around local contexts and priorities. These factors encouraged higher levels of local government ownership and commitment, as occurred with Nampula and some of the city-to-city alliances.<sup>15</sup>
91. The implementation of project components involved different dynamics and timelines that have influenced the level of achievement. Project implementation was initially planned for an 18-month period. All of the project components were given the same time period to deliver results and achieve outcomes. While this is standard practice, the diversity of initiatives (national and regional conferences, technical assistance for municipal pilot projects, city-to city alliances, best practices, supporting Habitat III) carried different implementation needs that precluded a "one size fits all" approach. Although UN-Habitat and the project partners were able to deliver most outputs and results, it is clear that longer timelines were needed to negotiate and implement city-to-city alliances under the third component. In retrospect, it was unrealistic to program the articulation of municipal actors from different countries—and subject to different fiscal calendars, legal/regulatory frameworks and electoral cycles—within such a short period.
92. Linkages between components could have been developed but this would need a more integrative approach. These linkages would have raised synergies between related outputs
- UN-Habitat's presence at the country level was important in raising project effectiveness and efficiency. Project activities were often supportive of existing UN-Habitat initiatives, and in turn were assisted by at the country level by HPMs and programme staff (i.e. Mozambique and El Salvador).
- The project lacked an over-arching project vision and its components were implemented independently of each other. However, the combination of unrelated initiatives within the same project served risk management purposes, as at least some results were likely to be achieved. This arrangement also encouraged "economies of scale" by applying a common management and administrative framework to the four components, which may have lowered servicing costs (as opposed to implementing four separate projects).

<sup>15</sup> An unexpected finding suggest that the design deficiencies of the signed project document encouraged ownership among executing partners represented on the Steering Committee, who were obliged to revise project components, deliverables and logical framework in order to improve the project's viability.

and results, enhancing aggregate impact. The project's formulation was affected by particular circumstances that discouraged a more integrative design process; most of component initiatives were recycled from earlier project proposals. Although the components underwent successive revisions following the project's approval, they remained segregated and were implemented as "stand alone" initiatives. The revision exercises could also have served to identify linkages connecting outputs and results of the four components, and reflect these linkages in project work plans, so as to articulate a more integral programme approach.

93. Linkages between components can create internal synergies. For example, if the project were viewed as a dynamic system, the case studies and

innovative practices derived from implementing decentralized technical assistance and pilot initiatives at municipal levels (linking results 2.1, 3.1-3.3) would have provided inputs for the dissemination of best practices (results 1.2, 4.3), which in turn would have fed into capacity building initiatives and national/regional events (feeding back to results 2.1,3.3, 1.1 and 4.4), strengthening urban policies and building a regional platform for Habitat III and the New Urban Policy (Outcomes 1, 3 and 4). This would have enabled a more programmatic approach by operationalizing linkages between complementary outputs and results, and streamlining arrangements for their execution.



## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

94. **Recommendation 1:** UN-Habitat's Programme Division, Regional Offices and technical branches should ensure that projects meet expected design standards before they are signed. This is particularly relevant in the case of high-profile projects that support strategic programmatic objectives such as Strategic Plan objectives, donor partnerships and UN-Habitat's global corporate image.

*Recommended actions:*

- The Executive Director (or the Programme Division) should issue a communication to Divisions and technical staff stating that projects will not be considered for signature unless they satisfactorily incorporate all observations and suggestions made by the Project Review Committee.
- There should be an established final "quality control" check by the Programme Division or the responsible implementing Regional Office or branch to ensure that PAG comments are reflected in the final draft.
- To the extent possible, the PAG meetings should devote more time and scrutiny to project proposals that exceed a certain budget size or geographic scale, in order to rationalize efforts and ensure that they are viable and presentable.
- A representative of the donor and/or proposed executing agency should be present at the PAG meetings (or participate online), when feasible, to identify flaws in design, propose adjustments and expedite the appraisal process.

95. **Recommendation 2:** An inception phase should be built into the design of regional or global projects that involve a given level of complexity in their scope and institutional arrangements. All projects face challenges in getting started; in the case of larger-scale initiatives that engage various institutions at different levels, this can lead to a significant loss of implementation time with detrimental effects on delivery and impact. A modest investment to ensure that the enabling

conditions for implementation are in place can make a difference

*Recommended actions:*

- Regional and global projects should include an initial one to three months inception phase (depending on need) that enables UN-Habitat and executing partners to formalize institutional arrangements, establish project management units, adjust and validate proposed work plans, and undertake essential recruitments prior to commencing implementation.
- Likewise, funds should be earmarked for at least one inception workshop to bring key partners and stakeholders together, adjust work plans and implementation strategies, and build a common vision. The time and resources required to assist the project's inception should be negotiated with the donor in advance, when applicable, to avoid cutting into the implementation period.

96. **Recommendation 3:** The UN-Habitat Evaluation Unit should study and promote cooperation modalities that integrate innovative approaches to implementation. UN-Habitat should build on the comparative advantages that set it apart from other donors and UN agencies, by promoting validated cooperation modalities that integrate innovative and validated approaches to implementation. The best practices demonstrated by this project and other UN-Habitat initiatives should be systematized and marketed as a validated cooperation modality "trademark" that can be adjusted to different project needs and contexts, and marketed to donors and recipient countries.

*Recommended actions:*

- The UN-Habitat Evaluation Unit should commission an independent evaluation of best practices in project design and implementation, that combines a comprehensive desk review of past project evaluations and direct consultations with UN-Habitat Branches and

Regional Offices, including the Programme Division. This evaluation should assess the recurrence of practices that have contributed to (or undermined) project efficiency and effectiveness, in order to arrive at a set of attributes that can be replicated in different contexts.

- The product of this proposed evaluation should be analyzed by the Executive Director's Office, Programme Division, Regional Offices and Branches to discuss findings, identify a "critical mass" of implementation practices that are interrelated and have improved project performance and cumulative effect, and explore options for their replication. This could highlight practices such as: (i) using technical assistance and project resources to build on the progress of existing urban initiatives, strengthening the project's catalytic effect by contributing to broader processes; (ii) raising the efficiency of country activities with "backstopping" support from HPMS, ongoing UN-Habitat initiatives; (iii) piloting and validating participatory methods that encourage ownership and commitment; (iv) informing national or regional policy levels on best practices; and (v) offering access to a broader online network of partners and technical assistance resources.
- The identified best practices should be presented as a "package" cooperation modality at Habitat III with selected local government representatives, rather than as isolated interventions. In sum, they offer an implementing mechanism for the New Urban Agenda that strengthens UN Habitat's position as a global actor for sustainable urban development.
- The inclusion of the practices mentioned above should be considered by the PAG in appraising project proposals when applicable.

97. **Recommendation 4:** The city-to-city alliances demonstrated a novel arrangement for municipal cooperation that is cost-effective and should be replicated. As a donor, Spain's contributions to UN-Habitat were affected by the country's recent macroeconomic problems and a third phase project was not considered. Nevertheless, the partnership with Spain continues and some of the cooperation modalities involving Spanish partners, such as the city-to-city alliances, have replication value. The

alliances worked through networks of Spanish and LAC local governments that collaborated on specific initiatives; the alliances were demand driven, and several were cost-effective in relation to standard project modalities. Two continue beyond the project.

**Recommended actions:**

- Document the process by which the alliances were negotiated and implemented, presenting it as a horizontal cooperation mechanism that can be replicated with local governments and support organizations in other countries. This could include case studies of alliances and initiatives that are being sustained with local government funding.
- Consider the application of city-to-city alliances, both nationally and between countries, as a cooperation mechanism for inter-municipal and regional planning and development projects.

98. **Recommendation 5:** The role of local governments at Habitat III should be defined to give greater momentum and direction to the preparatory process. This recommendation is outside the evaluation's scope yet addresses a recurring concern that was raised during the evaluation interviews. The role of local governments in Habitat III remains unclear and should be defined to ensure their timely contribution to (and validation of) Conference outcomes and the New Urban Agenda. The formulation of post-2015 sustainable development goals that succeed the MDGs offers a strategic opportunity to highlight the role of local government in the achievement of urban-related objectives, and could strengthen their position with regard to Habitat III.

**Recommended actions:**

- The progress achieved by the first project component needs to be nurtured and sustained. UN-Habitat, UCLG and other partners should continue to facilitate discussions at inter-governmental and PrepCom levels, and support local governments in developing proposals and platforms for Habitat III through their networks and National Habitat Committees. Bearing in mind the inter-governmental character of Habitat III, the role of local governments could focus on oversight and peer reviews of Conference proceedings, as well as the

presentation of regional priorities and policy platforms.

- UN-Habitat, UCLG and other partners need to advocate a lead role for local governments in achieving urban development and governance objectives, under the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals that will follow the MDGs. The recognition of local governments as key players within the SDGs would set an important precedent and could strengthen their position vis-à-vis Habitat III.

# ANNEXES

## ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

### 1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. UN-Habitat, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, is mandated by the UN General Assembly to promote socially and environmentally sustainable towns and cities. It is the focal point for all urbanization and human settlement matters within the UN system. UN-Habitat envisions well-planned, well-governed, and efficient cities and other human settlements, with adequate housing, infrastructure, and universal access to employment and basic services such as water, energy and sanitation. To achieve these goals, derived from the Habitat Agenda of 1996, UN-Habitat has set itself a medium-term strategy approach for each successive six-year period. The previous and the current strategic plans, Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) 2008-2013 and Strategic Plan 2014-2019.
2. Further as rationale of this project, the Commission on Human Settlements, at its 17th session in 1999 and its 18th session in 2001 decided that the documentation of best practices should be expanded to include examples of good policies and enabling legislation. The decision was further endorsed in paragraph 63 of the Declaration on Cities and Other Human Settlements in the New Millennium, adopted by the General Assembly at its special session in June 2001.
3. The project on Identification of Best Practices, Policies and Enabling Legislation in the Local Delivery of Basic Urban Services links to the MTSIP focus area 1: Effective advocacy, monitoring, partnerships, focus area 2: Promotion of participatory planning, management and governance, and Focus Area 3: Environmentally sound basic urban infrastructure and services. Projects outcomes, in term of identification of priorities and needs for further institutional reform and capacity building, were to provide opportunities for dialogue between local and regional governments about the requirements and roadmap to the implementation of effective decentralization policies inspired by the UN-Habitat Guidelines on decentralization and basic urban services, creating institutional networking in the Latin America region.
4. Additionally, the project was designed to support city-to-city cooperation of Spanish municipalities in the field of urban policies, with specific focus on physical and socio-economic planning. The project was to provide a set of examples of tried and tested urban policies and legislation of successful provision of public services by local government and relevant national-local policies and legislation in countries declared a priority by the Spanish International Cooperation Master-plan for 2009 – 2013.
5. The goal of the project was to support local and national governments in selected countries of priority for the Spanish cooperation to elaborate sustainable urban development priorities with special emphasis on urban governance to be achieved through a more balanced distribution of responsibilities and resources amongst the different spheres of government and thanks to better planning and efficiency of the public administration. The project had six different components, each one with a different set of expected accomplishments.

#### Component 1:

Phase II of the National Dialogues on urban governance to two additional Latin American countries

#### Expected accomplishments:

- Enhanced political consensus at all levels of government about the objectives and outcomes of the Habitat III preparatory process and its implications regarding the reform of the structure of the state and the redistribution of responsibilities amongst different territorial administrations regarding urban governance and planning.
- Contributing to the existing network of experts and policy makers in Ibero America to exchange experience and knowledge sharing amongst territorial public administration. Incorporation of these networks in their respective National Habitat Committees.

- Contributing to the identification of the national elements for the elaboration of Urban National policies.

### Component 2:

Analysis of the sustainable urban development network from the point of view of best practices, policies and enabling legislation

#### Expected accomplishments:

- Generation of territorial data on urban governance, social and cohesion able to measure the impact of decentralization in the quality and accessibility to public services to be used in the III GOLD Report elaborated by UCLG.
- Demonstration, through concrete experiences, about how strong and capable municipalities are better providers of basic urban services, with better quality and more affordable.

### Component 3:

Technical assistance on urban and socio-economic planning

#### Expected accomplishments:

- Experimentation of elements of planned city extensions, including the pilot physical delimitation of public space.
- Creation of local capacities in the selected municipalities
- Access of the population to basic urban services

### Component 4:

Consolidation of a group of Ministries and High Authorities on sustainable urban development

#### Expected accomplishments:

- Awareness on the upcoming Habitat III process as a multi-sectorial approach to urban policies.
- Increased presence of local and regional governments in the international decision making process dealing with urban issues.

### Component 5:

Supporting municipal urban planning through decentralized cooperation

#### Expected accomplishments:

- Strengthening local governments, technically, organizationally and politically.
- Increased cooperation between Spanish municipalities and their Latin American counterparts in issues related to integrated urban planning.

### Component 6:

Consolidation of UN-Habitat activities in Spain

#### Expected accomplishment:

- UN-Habitat Office in Spain recognized by Host Country Agreement and fully operational.

The duration of the project (A121) was planned for 24 months from October 2011 to October 2013 for an amount of EUR2.500.000 (USD3.4 million) by the donor, Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation. An additional extension to 17th February 2014 was subsequently approved by the donor.

## The Context

Many countries in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean have already completed processes for decentralization and empowerment of local government but often the transfer of responsibilities has not been accompanied by a sufficient capacities, financial and human resources. Local governments are in the front line with regard to the delivery of basic public services such as water, sanitation, public transportation or waste, all of them essential to ensure environmental sustainability (MDG 7). Local governments are also the first entry for citizens to their governments and the first gate of local democracy and participation in public affairs. Local government are responsible for the provision of basic service and in order to do their job they need normative capacity to act and some amount of local autonomy to be able to perform. To assure citizen's access to basic urban services there is need for increased accountability

and transparency in public management as well as human and financial resources.

The donor, Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation, made the specific indication to continue with the activities supported during Phase I of the project and to expand its scope including Mozambique and countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

## 1.2 Project Management

The project was decentralized in its various components to the UN-Habitat Regional Offices of Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC), to the Regional Office for Africa (ROAf – Mozambique) and the UN-Habitat office in Madrid, Spain. Coordination functions were performed by the Office of the Executive Director and subsequently transferred to the Local Government and Decentralization Unit, Urban Legislation, Land and Governance Branch in May 2013. The project was a follow up and expansion of a Phase I implemented by the Best Practices Office in Barcelona, Spain from 2008 to 2011.

The activities were carried out in close collaboration with the project Steering Committee that included the following partner institutions:

- United Cities and Local Government (UCLG)
- Province of Barcelona (Presidency of the UCLG Committee on Decentralization)
- Spanish Federation of Municipalities and Provinces
- Spanish Ministry for Public Administration
- Foundation for Iberoamerica and International Public Policies (FIIAPP)
- Andalusia Federation for municipal international solidarity (FAMSI).

The Steering Committee set the priorities for the project in terms of countries of intervention and evaluation of the proposed policies and legislation to be identified. The Committee sat formally all through the process and specifically at the beginning of the project, meeting annually.

Informal consultations and regular updates were conducted monthly by email and telephone.

## 2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

UN-Habitat is undertaking this evaluation of the projects in order to assess to what extent the overall support and technical assistance of UN-Habitat has been relevant, efficient and effective, and sustainable.

This evaluation is part of UN-Habitat's effort to perform systematic and timely evaluations of its programmes and to ensure that UN-Habitat evaluations provide full representation of its mandate and activities, including evaluation of work at country level and humanitarian and development interventions. The evaluation is commissioned by the Evaluation Unit in UN-Habitat and deemed strategic and timely in order to synthesize on achievements, results and lessons learned from the project. Subsequently, the evaluation is to be included in the revision of the 2014-2015 UN-Habitat Evaluation Plan.

The sharing of findings from this evaluation will inform UN-Habitat and key stakeholders, including partners, and member states, on what was achieved and learned from the project.

## 3. OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project on best practices (Phase 2) is to provide the agency, its governing bodies and donors with an independent and forward-looking appraisal of the agency's operational experience, achievements, opportunities and challenges. What will be learned from the evaluation findings are expected to play an instrumental role in shaping the focus of UN-Habitat in planning and programming projects, influencing strategies, adjusting and correcting as appropriate, exploiting opportunities, replicating and up-scaling the implementation approach used, and generating credible value for targeted beneficiaries and addressing national priorities. Evaluation results will also contribute to UN-Habitat's planning, reporting and accountability.

The period of the evaluation will cover from the start of the project in October 2011 to final closure as of October 2014.

### Key objectives of evaluation are:

- a) To assess progress made towards the achievement of results at the outcome and outputs level of the project;
- b) To assess the relevance of UN-Habitat in promoting sustainable national, regional and urban development by focusing on best practices and lessons learned transfer;
- c) To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects in achieving their expected results. This will entail analysis of delivery of actual outcomes against expected outcomes, in terms of delivery of outputs, achievement of outcomes and long term effects;
- d) To assess the extent to which implementation approaches worked well and did not work that were enabling for UN-Habitat to define the results to be achieved, to effectively deliver projects and to report on the performance of UN-Habitat;
- e) To assess the extent to which cross-cutting issues of gender and human rights in the design, planning and implementation, reporting and monitoring of the project;
- f) To bring forward programming opportunities that indicate potential for long-term partnership between UN-Habitat and local governments and their associations;
- g) To make recommendations on what needs to be done to effectively promote and develop UN-Habitat's support to promote urban governance, decentralization and its impact on the delivery of basic urban services.

## 4. EVALUATION SCOPE AND FOCUS

The evaluation is expected to assess achievement, challenges and opportunities of the project through an in-depth evaluation of results achieved.

The focus should be on the completed and ongoing activities of these projects and to advise on the programmatic focus of best practices, policies

and enabling legislation for urban governance, decentralization and the local delivery of basic urban services in the future.

The evaluation analysis will be based on the Theory of Change of the project i.e., outlining the results chain and integrated with the projects' Log Frame (see Annex I: UN-Habitat Evaluation Model).

## 5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS BASED ON EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will base its assessments on the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability in line with standards and norms of evaluation in the United Nations system:

### Relevance

- To what extent objectives and implementation strategies of the project are consistent with UN-Habitat's strategies and requirements of the beneficiaries (national and local governments)?
- To what extent is the implementation strategy responsive to UN-Habitat's MTSIP and Strategic Plan and human development priorities such as empowerment and gender equality?
- To what extent are the project's intended outputs and outcomes consistent with national and local policies and priorities, and the needs of target beneficiaries?

### Effectiveness

- To what extent have the project's intended results (outputs and outcomes) been achieved or how likely they are to be achieved in line with the Theory of Change (i.e., causal pathways) of the project? In this context cost-effectiveness assesses whether or not the costs of the project can be justified by the outcomes.
- What types of products and services did UN-Habitat provide to beneficiaries through this project? What kind of positive changes to beneficiaries have resulted from products and services delivered?
- To what extent have the projects proven to be successful in terms of ownership in



relation to the local context and the needs of beneficiaries? To what extent and in what ways has ownership, or lack of it, impacted on the effectiveness of the project?

### Efficiency

- To what extent did the project management, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Regional Office for Africa, UN-Habitat office in Spain and national partners have the capacity to design and implement the project? What have been the most efficient types of project activities implemented?
- To what extent were the institutional arrangements of UN-Habitat (at country, regional and headquarters levels) adequate for the project? What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent has this affected the project?
- To what extent did actual results contribute to the expected results at output and outcome levels?

### Impact Outlook

- To what extent has the project attained (or is expected to attain) development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants, whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.?

### Sustainability

- To what extent did the project engage the participation of beneficiaries in design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?
- To what extent was the theme of the project aligned with national development priorities and contributed to increased national investments to accelerate the achievement of priorities at national, provincial and city/local level?
- To what extent will the project be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels or encourage south-south and north-south collaboration, and collaboration between local government associations and authorities at local level?
- To what extent did the project foster innovative

partnerships with national institutions, local governments and other development partners?

The evaluation team may expound on the following issues, as necessary, in order to carry out the overall objectives of the evaluation.

- a) Responsiveness to local governments specific priority areas;
- b) Project's coherence with UN-Habitat's mandate and added value;
- c) Performance issues: effectiveness of monitoring and reporting of delivery and results of the project;
- d) Adequacy of institutional arrangements for the project and relevance of structures to achieve the planned results;
- e) Identification of contribution to success or failure of certain performances (responses to these issues should be categorized by design, management and external factors, particularly context);

## 6. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

It is expected that this evaluation will be participatory, involving key stakeholders. Stakeholders will be kept informed of the evaluation processes including design, information collection, and evaluation reporting and results dissemination to create a positive attitude for the evaluation and enhance its utilization. Relevant UN-Habitat entities, United Nations agencies, national partners, beneficiaries of the projects, donors, and other civil society organizations may participate through a questionnaire, interviews or focus group discussions.

## 7. EVALUATION METHODS

The evaluation shall be independent and be carried out following the evaluation norms and standards of the United Nations System. A variety of methodologies will be applied to collect information during evaluation. These methodologies include the following elements:

- a) Review of documents relevant to the project. Documents to be provided by the project management staff at Headquarters and Regional

Offices, and documentation available with the donor and partner organizations (such documentation shall be identified and obtained by the evaluation team).

Documentation to be reviewed will include:

- Original project documents and implementation plans;
  - Annual Workplan;
  - Monitoring Reports;
  - Reviews;
  - Previous evaluation documents;
  - Donor reports and evaluations;
  - Strategic plans, as deemed relevant, such as the Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) and Strategic Plan, United Nations Development Framework (UNDAF), National Development Plans, and other UN-Habitat policy documents.
- b) Key informant interviews and consultations, including focus group discussions will be conducted with key stakeholders, including each of the implementing partners. The principles for selection of stakeholders to be interviewed as well as evaluation of their performance shall be clarified in advance (or at the beginning of the evaluation). The informant interviews will be conducted to obtain qualitative information on the evaluation issues, allowing the evaluator to assess project relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.
- c) Field visits, if deemed feasible with resource available to the evaluation, to assess selected activities of the project.

The evaluator will describe expected data analysis and instruments to be used in the inception report. Presentation of the evaluation findings should follow the standard format of UN-Habitat Evaluation Reports (see checklist for UN-Habitat Evaluation Reports).

## 8. ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Evaluation Unit of UN-Habitat will commission a centralized evaluation of the project and it will manage the evaluation. A Joint advisory group with members from the Evaluation Unit, the Urban Legislation, Land and Governance Branch, the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Regional Office of Africa (Mozambique) and UN-Habitat office in Spain will be responsible for comments on the inception report and drafts of the evaluation report.

The Evaluation Unit will lead the evaluation, supported by the Local Government and Decentralization Unit by guiding and ensuring the evaluation is contracted to suitable candidate. The Evaluation Unit will provide advice on the code of conduct of evaluation; providing technical support as required. The Evaluation Unit will ensure that contractual requirements are met and approve all deliverables (Inception Report/ Workplan, Draft and Final Evaluation Reports).

The evaluation will be conducted by one consultant, an international consultant. The evaluator is responsible for meeting professional and ethical standards in planning and conducting the evaluation, and producing the expected deliverables.

The evaluator will be supported by the Evaluation Unit, the responsible Unit and project manager and focal points at relevant Regional Offices.

## 9. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation shall be carried out by one consultant. The International Consultant is expected to have:

- a) Extensive evaluation experience. The consultant should have ability to present credible findings derived from evidence and putting conclusions and recommendations supported by the findings.
- b) Specific knowledge and understanding of UN-Habitat and role in supporting the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals.

- c) Experience in working with projects/ programmes in the field of decentralization, urban development, local governance, and urban basic services.
- d) Advanced academic degree in political sciences, social economy, governance, local public administration, reform of the state, or similar relevant fields.
- e) Recent and relevant experience in working in developing countries.
- f) It is envisaged that the consultant would have a useful mix of experience and familiarity with public administration in various parts of the world.
- g) Fluent in both English and Spanish (understanding, reading and writing) is a requirement.

## 10. WORK SCHEDULE

The evaluation will be conducted over the period of 6 weeks, including the desk review, from January to March 2015. The consultant is expected to prepare an inception work with a work plan that will operationalize the evaluation. In the inception report understanding of the evaluation questions, methods to be used, limitations or constraints to the evaluation as well as schedules and delivery dates to guide the execution of the evaluation should be detailed.

## 11. DELIVERABLES

The three primary deliverables for this evaluation are:

- a) Inception Report with evaluation work plan. Once approved, it will become the key management document for the evaluation, guiding evaluation delivery in accordance with UN-Habitat's expectations throughout the performance of contract.
- b) Draft Evaluation Reports. The evaluation team will prepare evaluation report draft(s) to be reviewed by UN-Habitat. The draft should follow UN-Habitat's standard format for evaluation reports.
- c) Final Evaluation Report (including Executive Summary and Appendices) will be prepared in English and follow the UN-Habitat's standard format of an evaluation report. The report should not exceed 40 pages (excluding Executive Summary and Appendices). The Spanish translation of the Evaluation Report should also be presented. In general, the report should be technically easy to comprehend for non-specialists.

## 12. RESOURCES

The funds for the evaluation of the project are available from project's budget. Daily subsistence allowance will be paid only when working outside the official duty station of consultant. The remuneration rate of the consultant will be determined by functions performed, qualifications, and experience of the consultant. The consultant to conduct this evaluation should preferably be equivalent to P-5.

## ANNEX 2: PERSONS INTERVIEWED\*

- Diana Lopez, Project Coordinator, Local Government Decentralization Unit, Urban Legislation, Land and Governance Branch, UN-Habitat
- Carmen Sanchez Miranda Head of the UN-Habitat Liaison Office – Spain
- Elkin Velasquez Director, UN-Habitat Regional Office for Latin America & the Caribbean (ROLAC)
- Matthias Palivero Human Settlements Officer, UN-Habitat Regional Office for Africa (ROAf)
- Edgardo Bilsky United Cities and Local Government (UCLG)
- Arnau Gutierrez Camps Deputy Delegation for Barcelona (DIBA)
- Roberto Bernardo UN-Habitat Programme Officer – Nampula, Mozambique
- Diego Avila Municipal Government of Tarija, Bolivia
- Teresa Godoy Project consultant (INCIDEM)
- Maria Alejandra Rico Project consultant

\* *Interviews by skype*

## ANNEX 3: BIBLIOGRAPHY

A121 Budget Revision D (July 2013)

Proceso Preparatorio hacia Habitat III: Elementos de una Agenda Urbana Nacional en Ecuador (November 2012)

Anexo XX: Celebración del Día Mundial de Habitat 2012 (no date)

Documento de Proyecto: Identificación de buenas prácticas, políticas públicas y legislación facilitadora para la provisión local de servicios urbanos básicos (Revised project document - September 2012)

Informe de Resultados y Actividades 2012 - Proyecto: "Identificación de buenas prácticas, políticas públicas y legislación facilitadora para la provisión local de servicios urbanos básicos (II)" (no date)

Informe de Resultados y Actividades 2013 – 2014 - Proyecto: "Identificación de buenas prácticas, políticas públicas y legislación facilitadora para la provisión local de servicios urbanos básicos (II)" (no date)

Logical Framework and Performance Monitoring Matrix: Identification of best practices, policies and enabling legislation in the local delivery of basic urban services - Phase 2 (no date)

Marco de Resultados, Lecciones Aprendidas y Conclusiones - Proyecto: "Identificación de buenas prácticas, políticas públicas y legislación facilitadora para la provisión local de servicios urbanos básicos (II)" (no date)

Mesa de Diálogo – Gobiernos de Cercanía: Aprendizajes y Desafíos (May 2013)

Minutas IV y V Reuniones del Comité de Pilotaje

Programación Operativa de Actividades– P.O.A 2013 - 2014 - Proyecto: "Identificación de buenas prácticas, políticas públicas y legislación facilitadora para la provisión local de servicios urbanos básicos (II)" (no date)

Project document "Evaluation of Identification of Best Practises, Policies and Enabling Legislation in the Local Delivery of Basic Urban Services - Phase 2" (August 2011)

Relatoría Proceso Preparatorio Comité Nacional Hábitat, Capítulo El Salvador. Informe preliminary (May 2013)

Taller de Presentación y Balance de Resultados y Balance de Resultados: Componente "Alianzas Ciudad-Ciudad" (December 2013)

Taller de Programación Operativa Componente Ciudad-Ciudad: "Apoyo a la planificación urbana municipal a través de la cooperación descentralizada" - Cuenca, Ecuador (April 2013)

Taller de Programación Operativa Componente Ciudad-Ciudad: "Apoyo a la planificación urbana municipal a través de la cooperación descentralizada" – Manizales, Colombia (May 2013)

Taller de Programación Operativa Componente Ciudad-Ciudad: "Apoyo a la planificación urbana municipal a través de la cooperación descentralizada" – Santa Tecla y Delgado, San Salvador (April 2013)

Taller/Encuentro Proceso Preparatorio: Comisión Nacional del Hábitat capítulo Colombia (May 2013)

## ANNEX 4: EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX

Key Evaluation Questions: Relevance	UN-Habitat Executive Director's Office / Local Govt. & Decentralization Unit	UN-Habitat ROLAC & ROAAS	AECID	Municipal Govts of Sana Ana, Manizales, Nampula	Municipal Govts. involved in City-to-City cooperation	Partner executing institutions: CGLU, FEMP, FIIAPP, FAMSÍ	Steering Committee
1. To what extent objectives and implementation strategies of the project are consistent with UN-Habitat's strategies and requirements of the beneficiaries (national and local governments)?							
2. To what extent is the implementation strategy responsive to UN-Habitat's MTSP and Strategic Plan and human development priorities such as empowerment and gender equality?							
3. To what extent are the project's intended outputs and outcomes consistent with national and local policies and priorities, and the needs of target beneficiaries?							
<b>Efficiency</b>	UN -Habitat Executive Director's Office/ Local Govt. & Decentralization Unit	UN-Habitat ROLAC & ROAAS	AECID	Municipal Govts of Sana Ana, Manizales, Nampula	Municipal Govts. involved in City-to-City cooperation	Partner executing institutions: CGLU, FEMP, FIIAPP, FAMSÍ	Steering Committee
4. To what extent did the project management, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Regional Office for Africa, UN-Habitat office in Spain and national partners have the capacity to design and implement the project? What have been the most efficient types of project activities implemented?							
5. To what extent were the institutional arrangements of UN-Habitat (at country, regional and headquarters levels) adequate for the project? What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent has this affected the project?							
6. To what extent did actual results contribute to the expected results at output and outcome levels?							
<b>Effectiveness</b>	UN -Habitat Executive Director's Office / Local Govt. & Decentralization Unit	UN-Habitat ROLAC & ROAAS	AECID	Municipal Govts of Sana Ana, Manizales, Nampula	Municipal Govts. involved in City-to-City cooperation	Partner executing institutions: CGLU, FEMP, FIIAPP, FAMSÍ	Steering Committee
7. To what extent have the project's intended results (outputs and outcomes) been achieved or how likely they are to be? In this context cost-effectiveness assesses whether or not the costs of the project can be justified by the outcomes.							

<p>8. What types of products and services did UN-Habitat provide to beneficiaries through this project? What kind of positive changes to beneficiaries have resulted from products and services delivered?</p>		<p>UN -Habitat Executive Director's Office/ Local Govt. &amp; Decentralization Unit</p>	<p>UN-Habitat ROLAC &amp; ROAAS</p>	<p>AECID</p>	<p>Municipal Govts. of Sana Ana, Manizales, Nampula</p>	<p>Municipal Govts. involved in City-to-City cooperation</p>	<p>Partner executing institutions: CGLU, FEMP, FIIAPP, FAMSI</p>	<p>Steering Committee</p>
<p>9. To what extent have the projects proven to be successful in terms of ownership in relation to the local context and the needs of beneficiaries? To what extent and in what ways has ownership, or lack of it, impacted on the effectiveness of the project?</p>								
<p><b>Impact</b></p>								
<p>10. To what extent has the projects attained (or is expected to attain) development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants, whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.?</p>								
<p><b>Sustainability</b></p>								
<p>11. To what extent did the project engage the participation of beneficiaries in design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?</p>								
<p>12. To what extent was the theme of the project aligned with national development priorities and contributed to increased national investments to accelerate the achievement of priorities at national, provincial and city/ local level?</p>								
<p>13. To what extent will the project be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels or encourage south-south and north-south collaboration, and collaboration between local government associations and authorities at local level?</p>								
<p>14. To what extent were innovative partnerships fostered with national institutions, local governments and others?</p>								







United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)  
P. O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi GPO KENYA  
Tel: 254-020-7623120 (Central Office)  
[www.unhabitat.org](http://www.unhabitat.org)