

EVALUATION OF RESOURCE CITIES PROGRAM DESIGN

**Submitted to: Alison Paijit,
USAID/G/ENV/UP**

**Submitted by: Kathy Desmond,
Consultant to TCG International**

August 31, 2001

***Sustainable Urban Management IQC
LAG-A-00-99-00020-00
Quick Response Task Order TD #4***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY

INTRODUCTION	1
HOW THE EVALUATION WAS CONDUCTED	2
IMPROVING PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION	3
Success of Resource Cities Partnerships	3
Sustainability and Replication	9
Recommendations to Improve Program Design and Implementation	14
SCALING UP THE RESOURCE CITIES PROGRAM IN TARGETED COUNTRIES	21
Factors influencing USAID missions and operating units to expand or discontinue participation in the Resource Cities program	21
Facets of separate agreements by USAID Bulgaria, Indonesia, and Mexico that differ from the global cooperative agreement	22
Recommendations to scale up the Resource Cities Partnership program in targeted countries	23
Which countries to target? Characteristics that facilitate scaling up	28
ANNEXES	
1. Resource Cities Partnerships	31
2. Current USAID Funding of ICMA Resource City Partnerships	33
3. Task Order	34
4. Background Materials Reviewed	38
5. Informal Background Interviews	40
6. Interview Questions	42
7. Customer Interviews	45
8. Bulgarian Partnership Interviews	47

GLOSSARY

CDIE	Center for Development Information and Evaluation (USAID)
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer
FLGR	Foundation for Local Government Reform
G&A	General and Administrative costs
GIS	Geographic Information System
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ICMA	International City/County Managers Association
IR	Intermediate Result
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	non-government organization
PVO	private voluntary organization
RUDO	Regional Urban Development Office (USAID)
SWM	solid waste management
SWOT	strengths weaknesses opportunities and threats
US-AEP	US-Asia Environmental Partnership
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

INTRODUCTION

USAID's Office of Environment and Urban Programs awarded the Resource Cities cooperative agreement to the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) in September 1998 to assist the Agency to promote more effective local governments around the globe (G/ENV/UP's Intermediate Result 2.2).

The Resource Cities program facilitates the exchange of teams of local government officials—city managers, mayors, and department heads—between US and overseas cities over an 18- to 24-month period. The exchanges enable officials to learn from their peers and adopt pragmatic approaches to urban management problems. The partners develop a work plan with clear objectives and expected outcomes to remedy several challenges faced by the overseas city. Program funds cover international travel and accommodation costs, usually for four trips by American staff to the host country and three return trips to the American city. Local officials contribute their time, making the program a cost-effective means to provide technical assistance to developing and transitional countries.

To date, 29 partnerships have been initiated under this global cooperative agreement and 22 under other agreements of USAID missions with ICMA (Annexes 1 and 2). The partnerships have addressed areas such as solid waste management, budgeting and financial planning, downtown revitalization, citizen participation, and water and wastewater treatment. The collaborative effort has helped partnerships make significant changes in urban management overseas.

The purposes of this evaluation are: (1) to identify ways the program design can be improved and (2) to provide specific recommendations for ways to “scale up,” or increase the number of participating cities, in targeted countries. The evaluation asks these questions to enhance impact and achieve enduring change (Annex 3).

The evaluation used a rapid appraisal method and consisted of five tasks:

- Collect and review materials;
- Conduct informal background interviews;
- Conduct customer feedback telephone interviews;
- Conduct key informant interviews, including a site visit to a participating site; and
- Formulate recommendations.

The next section describes how these evaluation tasks were carried out in this assessment.

The findings and recommendations are based on the views and recommendations of the 80 persons consulted, participants in the Resource Cities program. Responsibility for analysis and formulation of the recommendations lies with the author of the report. I am grateful for the helpful direction of USAID's Alison Paijit and generous assistance of ICMA's Jon Bormet and Melissa Speed, USAID's Faye Haselkorn, and the Foundation for Local Government Reform (FLGR) twinning program staff in Bulgaria. Their contributions to the evaluation were invaluable.

HOW THE EVALUATION WAS CONDUCTED

The **collection and review of background materials** was facilitated by a study of the effectiveness of twinning programs by Research and Reference Services of USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE). Alison Paijit, the Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) of the Resource Cities program, requested this review. The USAID and ICMA members of the evaluation planning team, listed in Annex 3, sent this report and other materials to the evaluation consultant in late May 2001 (Annex 4).

The evaluation relied chiefly on open-ended questions discussed in telephone interviews and a site visit. Alison Paijit selected USAID and ICMA representatives for the **background interviews**. The consultant conducted most interviews over a two-week period in June (Annex 5). She tested the customer interview questions and revised them based on suggestions from the planning team (Annex 6).

The **customer feedback telephone interviews** were done in July 2001. ICMA selected five partnerships in discussion with the planning team, and provided contact information for the US city manager, overseas mayor, USAID staff, and other key participants for each. The consultant sent each an email with the interview questions on June 28 and 29, and followed up with telephone interviews (Annex 7). Most US city managers preferred to have other team members participate. ICMA suggested that the overseas contacts reply by email, their usual communication means. Three of the five partnerships were in the first year, one was nearing completion, and another was recently completed.

Key informant interviews. The CTO selected the Bulgarian partnerships for the site visit, conducted in the last week of July. Eleven partnerships have been funded in three phases, under a separate agreement between USAID/Bulgaria and ICMA: seven were funded in the first two phases; in the third, four new partnerships and four previous partnerships (replication cities) were funded. FLGR, a non-profit organization funded by USAID and others, assists the partnerships and municipalities throughout the country through dissemination of best practices and lessons learned. ICMA assists the institutional strengthening of FLGR. The evaluation focus in Bulgaria is to identify factors critical for sustainable success of the individual partnerships and lessons for "scaling up" in targeted countries. The consultant suggested that US and Bulgarian leaders of the four replication cities be interviewed; she contacted the US partners for phone interviews before the site visit. Alison Paijit, Jon Bormet, ICMA's Resource Cities Director, and Kathy Desmond, evaluator, accompanied by Ina Raicheva, FLGR's Technical Twinning Program Coordinator, visited five cities: three replication cities, one associated "replication site," and one new partnership. The Bulgarian municipal staff was asked the same questions as the other overseas participants. Representatives of the fourth replication city sent written responses to the questionnaire. The team also met with USAID mission staff. Most interviews in Bulgaria were group interviews (Annex 8).

Recommendations. Using interview notes, the consultant prepared her findings and recommendations. She incorporated the planning team members' review comments and suggestions in the final report.

IMPROVING PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

The recommendations to improve program design and implementation are based on an assessment of the success of the partnerships; stakeholders' views of the program strengths, their concerns, and their assessment of the effectiveness of the work of ICMA; and the sustainability and replicability of the partnership efforts.

Success of Resource Cities Partnerships

The success of the partnerships can be measured in many ways. This evaluation gathered information on the extent to which the partnerships met the objectives the partners agreed to in the beginning, as well as any unanticipated results. Almost all persons interviewed stated that their partnership either had or would meet the objectives in the work plan determined after the initial visits. Many also expected to exceed their objectives, either by accomplishing more than expected in the areas targeted in the work plan, or by other unanticipated benefits. USAID staff contacted, with a few exceptions, concurred.

ANTICIPATED RESULTS

Finding: Resource Cities Partnerships usually achieve the specific objectives regarding two or three discreet municipal management or service delivery issues the partners agreed upon in the Action Plan.

Working with ICMA's program director, the overseas mayor and the US city manager and staff develop the work plan, beginning with the diagnostic that identifies the overseas city's major needs. The Action Plan is completed and agreed on during the first two exchanges and progress is monitored according to this plan.

Finding: Concrete results include development of municipal strategic plans, new budgeting forecasting processes, citizen surveys, and citizen information centers; development of centers for economic development, incubators and marketing profiles to attract investment; analysis of specific improvements to water supply, wastewater, and solid waste management, including improvements in landfill management.

Often, the result of the 18-month partnership includes a plan for long-term solution to urban infrastructure and service needs, or economic development, with intermediate measures implemented during the partnership. Several partnerships—Naryn, Kyrgyzstan-Great Falls, Montana and Razgrad, Bulgaria-Brunswick, Ohio—emphasized that they are struggling to obtain funding to implement the plans developed.

Finding: Some reforms or innovations were dramatic departures from current practice in transitional countries and powerful models for change.

With assistance from Portage, Michigan, officials in Gabrovo, Bulgaria set up bidding procedures to sell municipal properties for economic development. Within 18 months, they designed and put four proposals out to bid, held pre-bid conferences, and sold four properties,

earning \$80,000 for the city, five times more than they expected. The winners developed their small businesses on the sites, creating 48 jobs. In turn, Gabrovo assisted the mayor of Tryavna and his staff to develop bid procedures and they sold a vacant kindergarten to a group to develop a four star hotel, in line with the city's economic development strategy. This one deal brought the city 500,000 of the 750,000 leva (2.2 lev to US\$1) earned from privatization deals conducted with the new procedures this year. When asked how this differed from previous practice, the mayor replied: "Before, we would have sold it for a kilo of tomatoes."

Replication is an intended result of the second period of funding of this partnership. The four Bulgarian cities funded again in the replication phase are actively working with other cities to adopt, or adapt, an innovation they developed with the US partner in the first phase. In other cases, replication is an unintended result.

UNANTICIPATED RESULTS

Finding: Most partnerships result in unanticipated benefits to the overseas cities, extending the value of the USAID grant.

Local officials, highly motivated by the partnerships, usually become involved in activities beyond those in the Action Plan. Consequently, many benefits are not tracked in official progress reports.

Finding: Unintended results included management changes suggested on a personal level.

Several US city managers mentioned that they were able to make suggestions, in private, to the overseas mayors because they were peers and because of the relationships they had developed.

- One discussed a mayor's management style that was overwhelming his staff.
- Another suggested an independent audit of the city's finances to counter corruption, or the perception of corruption.

Finding: Some partnerships engage private businesses and chambers of commerce to complement their work with municipal officials. The participation of US businesses can aid economic development efforts in overseas cities.

Partnerships have sponsored meetings of US businesses and potential investors with overseas cities businesses to promote foreign investment overseas. Usually these efforts are at the private businesses' own expense.

- Auburn, Alabama is sending three prominent businessmen to Blagoevgrad this month to investigate opportunities for them to invest in the region and/or to distribute Bulgarian goods in the United States.
- Abington, Pennsylvania has invited local businessmen to attend a presentation this month by the visiting Haskovo delegation on business opportunities in their region.
- Rayong, Thailand is sending a trade delegation to Portland, Oregon, to explore trade opportunities.

Finding: Often Resource City partnerships spur complementary partnerships with other institutions such as hospitals, universities, and schools.

- Two US cities, Abington, Pennsylvania and Brunswick, Ohio, made arrangements with a local private voluntary organization (PVO) to send medicines and medical supplies to hospitals in Haskovo and Razgrad. CareLift International’s program sends many times the value of money raised by US local groups.
- Abington’s hospital is forming a partnership to train Haskovo nurses and meet its own nursing shortage.
- Two of the nine US cities are providing a college education to students from their partner city: Auburn is enabling a young woman from Blagoevgrad to obtain her MA in public administration and Great Falls is providing four full scholarships to a local university for students from Naryn.
- Other cities promoted cultural exchanges (Auburn-Blagoevgrad) and educational programs about their partner city in their schools.

Finding: US city officials mobilize additional resources that supplement the contribution of their time and USAID funding.

USAID covers travel costs of local officials for the exchanges (normally four visits by US and three by overseas officials). ICMA asks local officials to calculate the value of their time and non-reimbursed expenses during the exchange visits and aggregates this to demonstrate that they meet the 28 percent cost-share requirement in the global agreement. Some cities exceed this percent. Moreover, most US city managers and their teams mobilize considerably more resources than these in-kind contributions during exchanges. Some additional resources are targeted to the work plan, some to meet other needs.

- Most tap the expertise of city staff to help on the work plan in-between visits; some seek assistance from the private sector. In one case, this involved thousands of dollars worth of donated private consultant time.
- Participants arrange for other visits by citizens, businesses or students, even extended stays overseas. One city manager’s son is working as a Peace Corps volunteer in the partner city at the request of the mayor.
- Participants invite other institutions to participate in activities with the partner city, such as those listed above, with their own resources.
- Participants donate computers (Great Falls, Brunswick) and raise funds to make small grants to their partner city (Great Falls).

Finding: Some partnerships have directly and indirectly impacted national policy.

These impacts often occur after the initial partnership period is completed and thus are not documented in end-of-partnership reports. Tracking direct impacts is a benefit the Bulgaria program’s replication phase. The Chief Secretary said that Blagoevgrad, working in a “trilateral partnership” with Auburn and FLGR for three years, is leading the way on three issues.

- 1) The first partnership produced a strategic plan with citizen input, called Blagoevgrad 2015. A year later the Regional Development Act required each municipality to produce a seven-year plan and theirs became a model for the nation.

- 2) With Auburn’s help, the city was the first to develop a GIS system that includes the metro area with its 25 villages and 22 mayoralities. Last year, the national Cadastre Act was passed to regulate the national system of surveys and maps of land ownership. Blagoevgrad is a pilot for the national system.
- 3) Blagoevgrad is one of three cities with a citizen information center (Gabrovo is another), and this year the national government required all cities to have them.

Also, the Resource Cities program may affect future national policy indirectly through leadership development. An active participant as Mayor of Blagoevgrad, Kostadin Paskalev was recently installed as Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Regional Development and Public Works. His experience working with US city officials to design and carry out these major changes in local government will inform his future decisions.

STRENGTHS AND BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM TO DATE AND THE MAJOR CONCERNS OF STAKEHOLDERS.

Finding: Participating municipal officials in the US and overseas countries are strongly supportive of the Resource Cities Partnership program. Their concerns center on finding resources to implement the changes on a sustained basis and continue the partnership.

Local officials on both sides of the partnership highlighted the program benefits to them and their top staff. Typical of comments received from overseas partners was the one by the mayor of Tryavna: “The partnership changed the thinking of all of us.”

Several US city officials described the intangible results of the program as changing local officials’ thinking about the role of municipal governments; about attitudes toward things like citizen participation, transparency, and ethics; and about the need to convene businesses and other institutions to help them solve problems. US city managers and their staffs said they, too, had been changed by the partnerships. Most often, city managers cited staff development as the rationale used to obtain council approval of their participation in the program, with motivation, creativity, and retention as sub-themes. (See Doug Watson article in Annex 4.) Several mentioned that they and their staffs were inspired by what small, under-resourced cities are able to accomplish.

On the other hand, nearly all local officials expressed concern about obtaining the resources needed to implement the plans or projects developed by the partnership. While most agreed that 24 months is sufficient time to carry out the specific activities they have agreed to, many said they had less time, 18 months, and even less by the time they had agreed on a work plan following the initial visits. Overseas cities, and some US cities, expressed the hope for more funding, if not to continue the partnership, then to continue the work it began.

Many indicated that other cities in the overseas countries want to participate in a partnership. US officials were aware of the need to recruit more US cities and offered to help promote the program among their US peers.

Finding: USAID staff value the core characteristics of the Resource City Partnership program: peer-to-peer learning, a pragmatic and technical focus, cost-effective technical assistance, the ICMA-developed model, and city matches.

USAID staff cited pragmatic benefits of the program: the value of peer-to-peer learning; the specific problem-solving focus of the effort in contrast with cultural exchanges; cost-effective technical assistance. They agreed that, in general, the methodology that ICMA developed for the program, beginning with the diagnostic and concluding with a best practices symposium, was sound. They also agreed with local officials that in most cases the match of cities was very good.

Finding: Main concerns of USAID staff were for greater flexibility in application of elements of the model in the global agreement, greater coordination with their overall strategies in a country, and a longer-term perspective.

While they agreed with the basic model, many USAID staff asked that the program permit greater flexibility—in duration of partnership, definition of partners, funding levels for in-country support organizations, and restrictions on use of US funds. Some of these issues result from administrative decisions; others result from the current contract mechanism or federal funding regulations. The program has evolved since the first partnerships, but some USAID staff are unaware of the changes. The desire for greater flexibility in application of the model was a key reason for the separate agreements.

Tim Grewe, of Portland, said that he uses examples of conservation and recycling that he saw in Cebu in his speeches on sustainability that he gives around the US. Matt Kridler, city manager of Springfield, Ohio, said “I consider it the most rewarding thing I’ve done in my 25 year career.”

Two RUDOs cited their decreasing funding as the main reason they did not continue to sponsor partnerships despite success of the initial partnerships. They lamented the decline in the number of partnerships in Africa and South America. The South African RUDO director said that the problem was reliance on mission buy-ins as the condition for participating in the program.

Several USAID staff said that the Resource City Partnership program should be closely related to the mission’s priority work, and coordinated with a larger USAID program with related elements, rather than a stand-alone program in a country.

Key persons in USAID, like ICMA and FLGR, advocated taking a five-year perspective, more like that of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities’ twinning program and the separate agreements.

Others reiterated the need for:

- more follow-up between visits; either a local counterpart/ intermediary organization or ICMA should have an on-the-ground presence to fill the gap between visits and keep the momentum going.
- involvement of someone who knew the country and could “translate” these realities to US municipal officials, who often lack international experience, and might otherwise propose inappropriate solutions to problems.

- improvement in tracking and, especially, disseminating partnership results and lessons learned internationally, as well as within the country.

SATISFACTION WITH ICMA’S ASSISTANCE

Finding: Local officials in US and overseas cities are very satisfied with ICMA’s assistance. It is especially critical in the initial stages of the partnership in helping them to agree on a feasible work plan that responds to the overseas city’s priority needs.

All the local officials consulted in this evaluation rated ICMA’s assistance highly. One suggestion was that ICMA be more involved in defining success measures and define expectations more clearly.

Finding: Most USAID representatives were also satisfied with ICMA’s efforts. A few noted the need for additional experienced staff members and expressed concern about start-up delays and lack of follow-through between exchange visits.

Not surprisingly, the assessment was especially positive for the successful partnerships. Several representatives were concerned about delays in starting up new partnerships. In Krygzystan, lack of follow-up by ICMA was cited as a problem in initiating one partnership; lack of USAID follow-up in another. In Thailand, concern was expressed over ICMA not bringing in-country US-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP) representatives into the process sooner, especially of selecting a US partner and local counterpart. USAID/Jakarta expressed concern about the delay in starting the diagnostic and arrival of resident ICMA staff. ICMA’s representative said that a main reason for the delay in starting the partnerships was recruiting US partners due to concerns about safety in midst of the turmoil prior to President Wahid’s departure.

Local officials in the US and overseas cities, asked about their satisfaction with ICMA’s assistance when ICMA was not present, said: “They’ve been there when we needed them and provided us answers about administrative things,” said one US city manager (Watson). Typical responses: “they were very supportive, listen well, and will do whatever they can within the guidelines of the program.” (Trimble). “Nothing but praise.” (Byrne).

Some USAID staff were concerned about the lack of ICMA presence to handle follow-through between exchanges. In Guatemala and Kyrgyztan, USAID assigned staff to do some coordinating functions that they felt should be ICMA’s. ICMA’s Bidus notes that staff can not be present when there is no funding for it, a reason he favors clustering of partnerships. One USAID representative felt that the problem was that ICMA lost a competition to handle local government programs that would have provided them resident staff (Kyrgyzstan). However, in Bulgaria, as in most countries with a partnership, ICMA does not have the major local governance contract with USAID.

Sustainability and Replication

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability considers a project’s duration after funding ends and its impact into the future. With regard to the Resource Cities Partnership program, sustainability involves two dimensions:

- 1) continuing the innovation, project, process, related ideas or values, and institutionalizing the particular reforms introduced during the partnership; and
- 2) continuing the partnership relationship.

This assessment obtained participants' views on whether they thought the innovations or reforms and partnerships would continue, and how, after USAID funding ended.

Finding: Resource City Partnership participants expected the partnerships to continue, but at a less intense level and without exchange visits of overseas participants to the US cities. They expected some of the reforms and changes to continue after USAID funding ended, especially those involving changes in their procedures, such as financial management and citizen participation. They did not know how they would obtain the finances needed to implement other planned changes, such as those involving urban infrastructure, but would seek to mobilize the resources needed.

1) Implementing proposed changes

The replies focused first on whether the plans developed during the partnership would be implemented after the funding period and exchange visits end. Some products, such as citizen information centers, new budgeting processes, bidding procedures, and similar activities are more readily institutionalized than implementing plans to overhaul major infrastructure services. However, as one mayor pointed out, even a relatively simple activity such as conducting a citizen survey involves costs and, despite his recognition of its value, must compete with other demands on the city's budget. Other products, such as a Center for Economic Development or an incubator, would need subsidies until they could become self-supporting, with the same constraint. Almost all local officials in overseas countries with work plans to improve urban infrastructure expressed a commitment to finding the resources to do so, but they were not so confident that they would succeed. Similar concerns were expressed by US city officials, who added that they did not know about opportunities for international financing and needed some assistance on this. One stated that he thought his role was to position the partner city so that it would be able to obtain this financing.

Several local officials related their concern for sustainability to the short term of the partnerships, saying that they need more time to complete the project and carry it through one cycle with local officials to ensure that the changes would be institutionalized. A city manager working on reforming budgeting to include forecasting said that 18 months was too short, especially given the differing budget cycles of the two cities.

2) Applying lessons learned to other programs and internalizing new concepts

Another aspect of institutionalizing an innovation or reform is for the participants to apply lessons learned about municipal planning and management to other areas of urban responsibility and apply the concepts and lessons they learned throughout the partnership. Several Bulgarian officials interviewed said they hoped that their colleagues—two mayors participating in the Resource Cities program for three or more years who are on the new cabinet—will remember what they learned and apply it in their new positions. Future best practices symposia may ask participants how they applied what they learned during the partnership. The ripple effects of the

partnerships, and of the personal relations developed, are all aspects of the program's long-term impact since they would not have occurred without the USAID program. But they may be overlooked since they are not directly funded by USAID.

3) Continuing financial support by USAID

USAID can help sustain an effort by funding successful partnerships for a second period through ICMA. An example is Phase III of the Bulgarian Technical Twinning program. The local officials continue to receive technical assistance from the US city and from FLGR. Working to replicate their efforts in other cities also deepens their acceptance of the change and its application in their own city.

Another way USAID can sustain an effort, when it recognizes the importance of the reform initiated under the partnership, is to support it financially through another USAID program. The El Salvador mission has supported directly the Corporacion de Municipalidades de la Republica de El Salvador (COMURES), the El Salvador Municipal Association, after its Resource Cities partnership ended. The Romania mission is continuing to fund the Sibiu- Traverse City, Michigan partnership to develop an industrial park in accord with the county economic development strategy, through World Learning. The Russia mission is funding replication of Novgorod's financial management and new procurement systems, developed with the assistance of Hartford, Connecticut, in three other metro areas, through its Public Finance Program with Research Triangle Institute, "which costs USAID three to four times what the Resource Cities Program cost." In addition, the USAID mission incorporated ICMA's diagnostic findings into its strategy paper, so it provided a basis for and direction to USAID's program on improving local financial management.

4) Continuing partnerships without USAID funding

In general, local partners felt sustaining the partnership was a goal of the Resource Cities program more than USAID and ICMA staff, who were eager to contrast the program from other international partnerships based in Europe and the US that have this as a primary goal. All the local officials, US and overseas, said they expected the relationship to continue, although at a less intense level. Many were already in frequent email contact with each other and expected this form of communication to continue, often with the aid of translators overseas. Several US cities said that they could manage raising the funds to continue their visits overseas, but they and the overseas officials said that they did not expect the return visits to continue. Most US managers said it was difficult for them to tap city funds for the direct costs of the program, but easy to contribute their time. Several said they expected the contributions of goods, services and money from their citizens for the overseas city to continue.

REPLICATION

Replication involves adopting the innovation or change in another place and thus extends the impact of the original partnership to other cities or towns. This assessment asked participants how they were sharing the lessons learned with other municipal officials in the overseas country and whether other cities were adapting or adopting the same changes. While replication can be an unintended result of successful partnerships, this section focuses on planned replication.

Finding: The Resource Cities Partnership program is an excellent way to pilot and demonstrate the feasibility of a municipal management change, financial management reform, or municipal service delivery innovation. The best practices symposium, planned replication sites, and media coverage are effective ways to identify and disseminate the field-tested innovations widely.

1) Best practices symposium

The best practices symposium is one way each partnership aims to spread lessons learned to other municipal officials in the overseas country. The best practices symposium can also help launch the new partnerships. The first symposium in Bulgaria, held in Albena in 1998, included US and Bulgarian municipal officials from the new round as well as the first round. The sharing of experiences helped the new partnerships focus their work plans more clearly and get started sooner. For example, after listening to the reports of the first round participants at this meeting, Gabrovo-Portage officials decided that they would focus on something do-able without additional funding, something that would bring in funds to the city in a short period of time, rather than having a plan be the result of the partnership.

2) Planned replication sites

The first example of designed replication is in the third phase of the Bulgarian Technical Twinning program. It spreads the innovations introduced by the partnerships to other cities not only by sharing information and experiences through the local support NGO, but also by funding the partners to work directly with other cities.

Each of the Bulgarian replication cities proposed to work together with other cities on specific projects in the competition for refunding for a second period. Each is helping other cities carry out a project that it successfully completed in its own. Gabrovo is successfully replicating its *Public Private Partnerships for Economic Development* project in Tryavna and Sevlievo; Blagoevgrad and Auburn are replicating their marketing profile project and website in Sliven and strategic plan in Dobrich; Razgrad is working with Novu Pazar and Haskovo with Hamanli on marketing profiles to attract investment.

These cities are simultaneously engaged in another kind of replication, one that expands their initial work outward to include additional cities, towns and villages in a common effort.

- The mayor of Razgrad recently met with 80 mayors and officials in his region to discuss how they might become involved in the work of the Center for Economic Development and share

the business incubator in his city. He called this “replication by extending the service area of the center.”

- Blagoevgrad–Auburn are building on their initial landfill management and redevelopment project to develop plans, in this phase, for a new regional landfill for the city and its surrounding communities.
- Razgrad is expanding on its initial project to develop a tourism strategy for Razgrad to working on a joint program for tourism development with the cities of Veliko Turnovo and Shumen.

3) *Media coverage*

The Rayong-Portland officials—and other city managers and overseas mayors interviewed—cited media coverage as an effective way to disseminate the lessons learned to other cities. On their first visit, the Portland staff made a presentation to the annual conference of the municipal league that was covered by the local press. On their second visit, a member of the Portland delegation was interviewed for the equivalent of *Good Morning Thailand*. The USAID-funded Kenan Institute sent a journalist with the Thai delegation to Portland and he prepared two TV programs that were broadcast throughout the country in June.

Finding: Dissemination is most effective when led by a municipal association or a non-profit municipal support organization with a stake in the partnership. They share results and lessons learned in their meetings, publications, peer exchanges, media contacts, and web sites. These efforts are strengthened when: attention is given to strengthening the intermediary; their role in the partnership is formalized; and there is more than one Resource City partnership in a country.

4) *Linking dissemination efforts with municipal associations*

The program can multiply its impact in overseas countries by working with municipal associations. Lessons learned and innovative case examples can be disseminated in association publications and meetings. In every partnership interviewed except Naryn, USAID and US city officials said that the municipal association was involved. But most of the partners have not given much, if any attention, to replication because they are beginning or in the middle of their first partnership. Several US officials emphasize that the work they are developing would be readily adaptable to other cities.

“The League of Municipalities is ideal for replication. Resource Cities participants will be able to identify and reflect on ways the changes tested in Cebu can be put to systematic use by others in the country. The League will develop ways to disseminate lessons learned, identified in the final workshop, and will follow up with dissemination.” (Batac). The USAID representative (MacLeod) says that with the participation of these two organizations, if the partnership continues to be successful, it will automatically be replicated countrywide.

If the municipal associations have a stake in the initial partnership and view it as a demonstration, they can then disseminate the program throughout the country. The Cebu, Philippines-Fort Collins, Colorado partnership actively involved a representative of the League of Municipalities of the Philippines and the regional manager of the International Council for

Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) in the partnership. Both cities participated in ICLEI's Cities for Climate Protection program, and this common bond was a key reason for the match. Similarly, the USAID representative in Thailand feels that the Rayong-Portland partnership will be replicated because of "the wide variety of partners in both sides," connecting Portland's resources with the Municipal League of Thailand and a local development institute.

The ICMA/USAID experience is that often these associations need to be strengthened, some are closely tied to political parties as in Bulgaria and Mexico, and most do not focus on technical areas such as solid waste management. The Jakarta agreement, therefore, decided to use the twinning concept to strengthen these associations in Indonesia, matching the League of Oregon Cities with national associations of city, county, and provincial officials. Strengthening municipal associations is an important component of the Mexico agreement, as well. The Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities of Serbia could have a similar dissemination role as FLGR, as well as its current role handling logistics and communications for the four partnerships in Serbia, if it were strengthened, according to a US city manager.

5) *Linking dissemination with a non-profit municipal support organization*

The strongest efforts to identify lessons learned and disseminate them within a country have been made in the separate agreements that design a role for a local non-profit organization to facilitate replication. FLGR brings Bulgarian partners together for quarterly meetings in Sofia, visits them, and then shares lessons learned in their newsletter sent to all 262 municipalities in the country, other publications, and on their website (www.flgr.org). The Mexican cooperative agreement builds in a major effort to disseminate lessons learned and includes a project to develop and apply local governance performance measures. ACCEDDE (Accion Ciudadana por la Educacion, Desarrollo y Democracia) receives a subgrant from ICMA to work with the Jalisco cities to develop citizen oversight committees for the various municipal departments.

Finding: Partnership efforts within a country are well documented. But the Resource Cities program has not documented well the overall achievement or lack of achievement of the intended outcomes, impacts and lessons learned of the Resource Cities partnerships as a whole. Factors include lack of funding for this, dispersal of responsibility for the program among USAID units, ICMA staff turn over, and lack of a research orientation among practitioners that are the strength of the program.

6) *Documenting and disseminating results*

Generally, partnership efforts within a country are well documented: diagnostic reports and Action Plans provide baseline information; trip notes by US partner cities and ICMA quarterly reports for USAID help monitor progress; and lessons learned symposia summarize results to date, short-term outcomes. Special funding is given in the separate agreements to documenting results and disseminating them country-wide. FLGR tracks results for the USAID mission, enabling the mission to report on progress toward the mission's objectives (intermediate results). But means of sharing information and lessons learned overall, between countries and globally, have not been developed.

Recommendations to Improve Program Design and Implementation

1. *Extend the time period of support of Resource City partnerships by increasing the duration of the initial partnership to 24 months, allowing no cost extensions, and refunding successful partnerships.*

The initial partnership period should be 24 months after the Memorandum of Understanding is signed. The MOU identifies the two or three discreet issue areas that the partnership will address and is signed before the first visit. Extensions can be no cost extensions, as they are now, and given to accommodate delays due to difficulties of travel to remote areas (e.g., winter delaying the first trip to Naryn) or other unforeseen circumstances.

USAID/ICMA should have the option to refund successful partnerships (i.e., fund them for a second 18- to 24-month period) to facilitate implementation and institutionalization of the reform and to extend program activities to a wider area or other cities. Allowing for such “merit-based extensions” within a country can be done on a competitive basis and at a lower level of funding per partnership, meaning fewer exchange visits, as it was in the third phase of the Bulgarian program.

Implications for new agreement. Since partnerships must be completed before the cooperative agreement ends, planning for extensions means that the new global agreement (Leader/Associate awards mechanism) should be in place by mid- 2002.

These changes do not necessarily involve a reduction in the number of partnerships supported under the global agreement given a level amount of its funding. The amounts for specific actions, such as exchange visits, and overall amounts for buy-ins may be allowed to vary, as they do in the separate cooperative agreements.

Advantages/disadvantages. The main advantage of a longer period of support (from 18 to 24 months) is that the partnerships will have a greater chance of implementing the change and institutionalizing the reform; and the program will have more time to disseminate it. This is even more true of refunding successful partnerships for a second period. Refunding some, however, would reduce the number of new partnerships in a country.

2. *Ensure that resource mobilization and financing considerations are an integral part of the partnership efforts so that plans to improve municipal management and services can be implemented.*

USAID/ICMA and the US city managers’ shared orientation is to develop pragmatic Action Plans limited to a few, carefully-selected issues based on a diagnostic analysis. The challenge, all agree, is obtaining resources for implementation. Ways to do this start with ICMA making the following points during the diagnostic visit and selecting the US partner:

- Include in the Action Plan activities that are doable in the time frame, *do not cost a lot to implement*, and have a payoff related to employment, economic development or other visible benefit to residents. The Gabrovo example of developing new procedures to dispose of

municipal property is a good example of this approach. In addition to creating jobs and contributing to economic development in the city, it also increased municipal revenues.

- *US officials should propose low-cost, labor-intensive technologies that are appropriate to the resource level of the host city.* The Auburn solid waste staff proposed extending the life of Blagoevgrad's landfill with several low-cost, labor-intensive technologies, for example, covering it daily with dirt to contain combustion. This requires changing the usual thinking of both sides: helping the US officials to recognize the fiscal limitations and learn about more appropriate technologies than the capital-intensive engineering ones they use at home and helping the overseas cities to accept them. Great Falls officials took representatives from Naryn to look at a waste water settlement lagoon on an Indian reservation that used electricity only for aeration. They also sent photographs of a nearby gravity-powered water supply system built by Chinese immigrants in the 1860s and recommended these kinds of solutions for Phase 1, leaving the high tech plans for later phases.
- *Action Plans should include a task for the partners to plan how to mobilize local resources—including user fees, utility tariffs, private sector participation, and national programs—to implement the long-term changes.* Given the responsibility of local officials to provide basic urban services, most partnerships also tackle a problem that requires a long-term solution and considerable time to develop a plan, for example a strategic plan for economic development or to revamp the water supply or solid waste management system. Expectations of overseas officials are high, especially after the first visit to the US city. Both sides, however, will be frustrated—and the partnership will have little impact ultimately—unless they identify realistic ways to raise the resources to implement it. This includes examining options to increase user fees, obtain resources internally from the locale, and tap various levels of government and private funding in the country.
- *USAID/ICMA should provide partners information about donor funding in the country and orient them to propose appropriate technologies and identify in-country sources of revenue to accomplish their plans.* The USAID mission should provide information about donor funding during the diagnostic and first visit of the US team. ICMA should provide the US partners with this information, or information on how to obtain it, e.g., copy of USAID mission strategy, World Bank contact information, and web sites of funders active in the country.

The most effective way to manage local partners' expectations is to work with them on internal resource mobilization and educate them about donor programs in the host country. For example, several US cities mentioned that they are looking at the feasibility of bond financing of urban infrastructure in the overseas city, an issue dealt with by some larger USAID funded projects. The possibility of obtaining direct USAID or donor funding of an infrastructure project should be dispelled at the beginning. At the same time, USAID should make the partners aware of complementary efforts so that they can design their plans in this light.

Implications for new agreement. Consider adding the above sentence in italics to description of services provided by ICMA.

Advantages/disadvantages. Asking the USAID mission to provide an orientation to ICMA and US city officials on donor funding in the country will enable the partners to see how their work fits in with the overall USAID program in the country (and vice versa), enable future coordination between the partnership and other donor-funded programs, and educate US and overseas officials about the opportunities and limitations of this funding. The disadvantage is that this would add to ICMA's workload at the beginning of the partnership.

3. *Set up a small fund in each country that the partnerships can apply to for a small grant of up to \$5,000 to help them implement a priority activity in the work plan.*

Several partnerships, support organizations, and one CTO mentioned that overseas officials were constrained in progressing through their work plans by lack of an item such as equipment, especially computers, software and Internet access, or access to local expertise required by law. One city manager carried a used computer as baggage overseas. Often a small grant would enable local officials to produce a tangible product, for example a new marketing brochure or website, that boosts morale and speeds up progress on the work plan. Placing conditions such as requiring matching funds or in-kind services would extend the small grant's value.

Implications for new agreement. This would add \$5,000 to the cost of each partnership, potentially. Approval could be required from both the ICMA manager and the USAID mission/operating unit.

Advantages/disadvantages. The advantage would be speeding progress in carrying out agreed upon activities. Also, if funds were used for computers, software and Internet access, communication between partners on shared tasks would be greatly facilitated. Consequently, the program would likely have better results by the end of the partnership period. The potential disadvantage would be fostering the expectation that further USAID funding would be available for the project.

4. *In the new global agreement, allow for an expanded role for a local intermediary, to include providing on-going technical support and training, partnership monitoring, and dissemination of lessons learned, as well as logistical and translation services for the partners. Allow for ICMA to provide capacity building assistance to the municipal association or municipal support PVO.*

Currently, third party organizations, municipal associations or municipal support PVOs, are hired by ICMA to provide logistical support, communication, and translation services in the overseas country. On average, about \$3,000 is allocated for this basic level of support. These organizations provide helpful advice to the US partners, who often lack international work experience and are unfamiliar with the country. The change would be to add to the global agreement what is now in the separate agreements, the option to include more services, each with a range of funding levels. For example, FLGR provides "partnership management services," which includes tracking progress and reporting to ICMA and USAID. Other services could be to provide technical assistance to the overseas cities in between exchanges; document and disseminate best practices; and link the partnerships with associations or other regional and national efforts. The Mexico and Jakarta agreements include a component to strengthen

municipal associations. In the Bulgaria agreement, ICMA provides “institutional strengthening” assistance to FLGR. The Mexican and Bulgarian agreements contain separate provisions, and funding, for dissemination of lessons learned.

Implications for new agreement. The new global agreement should be flexible enough to permit such expanded arrangements with third party organizations. If selected, these options could greatly increase the amount allocated for support organizations. However, paying for some additional services does not necessarily have to come from the USAID unit buy-in to the Resource Cities program. USAID is funding the support organizations separately in Bulgaria and Thailand for dissemination functions. Also, USAID could consider working with other contractors for selected tasks. But it should be possible to build these services into the buy-in, especially since the funds would be from the mission or operating unit, and they would be responsible to design the Resource Cities program in their country.

Advantages/disadvantages. The advantages of increased funding of local support organizations would be better results and increased chances of sustainability and replication of successful innovations country-wide. The ideal would be to establish “trilateral partnerships” between the two cities and the association or support organization, so that in between visits and after funding ends the overseas city is part of a larger program that has some ownership or stake in disseminating the innovation.

The advantage of flexibility in the global agreement would be eliminating an incentive for separate agreements. Since the additional costs would be borne by the mission/operating unit, the global agreement change would allow that option.

This recommendation would increase program costs. Working with more key players early in the partnership would add to the demands on ICMA’s already stretched thin senior program staff and require them to hire additional experienced staff or consultants. It might slow the start of the partnership if USAID or ICMA did not have a working relationship with the organization. Without an overall increase of funding, recommendations that increase funding for host country organizations and ICMA mean either fewer partnerships or a lower level of funding of each.

5. *Provide US city managers and their team more information at the beginning of the partnership. Invite a representative from the local support organization, the global CTO, and USAID mission representative to participate in the initial orientation of the US team. Provide the US team relevant information from other partnerships.*
- A representative of the intermediary support organization should be available to the US team during its visits to the overseas city. The support organization could prepare a packet of information about the country that would complement the diagnostic report prepared by ICMA. In the first visit, the PVO representative should explain the political, economic, and local government context to the visiting US team. This person should identify the main regional and/or national actors, especially associations and NGOs, that should be aware of the partnership’s effort, can provide advice, and disseminate the lessons learned widely. Also, the person or organization responsible for follow-up in-between exchange visits should

be introduced to the teams, if different from the local counterpart organization responsible for logistics and translation services

- The Resource Cities CTO or delegate should meet with the US team on its first visit overseas and explain the goals of the program. The mission representative (local CTO) should give an overview of USAID funding in the country, especially as it relates to the issues the partnership has selected, and explain how the partnership fits in with their strategy. The mission representation should also provide information about the local government program, distribute contact information for the implementing firm, and urge cooperation and communication between ICMA, the local city partners, and the firm. USAID CTO and the ICMA manager should explain their expectations for the participating cities, how they measure the success of the program, and their reporting requirements and preferences.
- ICMA should give the diagnostic report to US city managers before their first visit, if possible.¹ ICMA should supplement the diagnostic with other country context information and information about USAID, the World Bank, and other donor programs, especially those related to issues in the MOU, with contact information. ICMA could delegate the task of collecting information on the country context to the local counterpart organization and focus its efforts on the donor information. If there were previous partnerships in the country, ICMA should ask them to suggest books, reports, articles, and web sites that they found most helpful and share this information with the new group.
- Similarly, ICMA should share examples of successful projects and lessons learned among partnerships addressing the same issue, across countries. For example, the teams working on solid waste management (SWM) would find instructive the paper that summarizes the meeting in which participants from two Paraguayan cities, the local support PVO, and officials from Austin, Texas and Albuquerque, New Mexico identified transferable SWM technologies and non-transferable technologies and made other recommendations (Delivery order #36, summary report). ICMA partnership managers should pull together existing ICMA materials: descriptions of related partnerships and case studies prepared for best practices symposia. (Also see recommendation 6 in next section.)

Implications for new agreement. Consider adding these items to ICMA (or winning bidder) responsibilities.

Advantages/ disadvantages. Better informed US partners can provide better technical assistance and shorten the amount of time spent on learning the opportunities and constraints faced by the host city. Additional responsibilities mean additional costs.

6. *Provide more information about the Resource Cities partnerships to USAID and engage USAID missions more in the partnership(s) in their country.*

¹ Senior ICMA staff visit the overseas city to prepare the diagnostic report for other purposes: to learn about the local city and meet its officials, orient the mayor and his staff to the program, and begin to help them narrow the issues. Consequently, ICMA senior staff is better prepared to select a US city for the partnership, help partners agree on issues and an Action Plan in the first two exchanges, and monitor this project. The local counterpart organization can assist ICMA in preparing the diagnostic report.

ICMA/USAID/Washington should better inform USAID missions about the partnerships in their country and the changes in the overall program. ICMA engages missions in the diagnostic and identification of the partners, asks them to meet the US partners on their first visit, sometimes communicates in-between visits, and invites them to plan and participate in the best practices symposium. Diagnostic reports, MOUs and Action Plans, and trip reports are helpful ways of keeping USAID staff informed, but are not consistently shared with USAID staff. When the RUDOs and USAID/Washington funded the early partnerships, the missions were not very involved, except in countries with RUDO offices or resident ICMA staff, and they usually did not receive copies of these reports.

USAID/Washington should communicate with the missions, providing them information about the new partnerships in their country, including sending them copies of leader/associate agreements for partnerships in their country and other documents.

- ICMA should provide missions copies of the diagnostic reports, MOUs, Action Plans, US city trip notes, and other appropriate materials.
- USAID's CTO should develop a plan for regular dissemination of these reports and inform ICMA of changes in USAID mission contact persons.
- Every effort should be made to accommodate mission information requests. If a specific request, for example translating US trip notes, involves additional costs, the mission should be informed and some adjustment made.

In addition, ICMA/USAID should provide information to all missions and operating units about the lessons learned and impact of the programs, new models, and agreements. It would be helpful to aggregate the information about all the Resource Cities partnerships, with the different funding mechanisms, partnership models, and levels of intermediary support explained. Once the new global agreement is in place, the CTO could send this information to the missions/operating units with an introduction of the new Leader/Associate contract mechanism.

Implications for new agreement. Review ICMA responsibilities to communicate with USAID missions and operating units about partnerships in their country. Consider adding a dissemination task about regular communication with all missions and operating units on the Resource Cities program as a whole, including activities funded in the separate agreements, such as producing a quarterly bulletin or newsletter.

Advantages/disadvantages. The reasons to provide better information about the partnerships to the USAID missions and engage them are: first, to help integrate the efforts of the partnership in that country with other USAID programs; and second, to obtain their support for the program. Adding tasks for ICMA requires additional funds.

SCALING UP THE RESOURCE CITIES PROGRAM IN TARGETED COUNTRIES

“Scaling up” means increasing the number of overseas cities participating in the partnership program in a given country. This section of the report will look at a variety of means and models, to accomplish this goal. The 23 USAID employees consulted for this evaluation were asked to identify the main reasons they and others had for participating in the program, expanding it, and/or for not continuing to participate after an initial partnership. All persons interviewed were asked to comment on an alternative to the standard one-on-one partnership between cities in which one US city would assist five or six overseas cities address a common issue, and make recommendations to scale up. Also, we sought to identify facets of the separate Resource Cities agreements of USAID missions in Bulgaria, Indonesia, and Mexico that differed from those in the global agreement, on the assumption that they might be added to the new global agreement and to make it more responsive to mission needs. In the past two years, the greatest growth of new partnerships has taken place through the separate agreements. Each of these agreements supports a cluster of partnerships, effectively scaling up the program in a country.

Factors influencing USAID missions and operating units to expand or discontinue participation in the Resource Cities program

The countries that renewed participation in the program after the first partnerships were completed are Bulgaria, Mexico and recently Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe is the first example of the early idea that the RUDOs would partner with the global office in funding an initial partnership that would be followed by the mission’s buy-in for a second partnership.

Finding: USAID mission/operating unit decision to continue participation in the Resource Cities program after an initial partnership is based primarily on the fit with mission strategy and funding priorities—how well the partnerships are integrated with and support the mission’s objectives and programs—and secondarily on the success of the initial partnerships.

USAID staff interviewed said that successful first partnerships with visible results and impact, and the partnerships’ fit with mission strategy and funding priorities—and how well they are integrated into USAID’s other work—were the most important factors in the mission decision to expand or renew its participation in the program.

Most missions consulted that did not renew, on the other hand, recognized that the initial partnership was successful, but either they did not have sufficient funds for another partnership (the RUDOs) and/or they had other priorities. Several continued funding the initial partnership under another program to implement the plans (Sibieu), continue the work (El Salvador), or to replicate it in a wider area (Novgorod). In a couple of cases, renewal was not possible because the mission closed (Swaziland). Only one said that they probably would not renew because of lack of results of the initial partnership (Kyrgyzstan), but that was less important than the fact that Urban Institute was awarded the large local governance contract and ICMA did not have a resident staff person, so mission oversight of the program was difficult. USAID used the Urban

Institute staff person for this liaison even though ICMA had contracted with a local counterpart organization, the Royal Scientific Society, for logistical support and dissemination services and they could be tapped by USAID for this.

Finally, several said that the limitations of the global agreement—or its strict interpretation by the former CTO—affected their decision to not renew participation in the program. Lacking information or even a copy of the global agreement, it was not clear to one how to obligate money. Delays resulted. Others wanted more ability to manage the program from the mission and more flexibility to design it to meet their needs, for example, by increasing the time period and allowing more funds for a greater role for a local intermediary, and so they entered into separate agreements with ICMA.

Facets of separate agreements by USAID Bulgaria, Indonesia, and Mexico that differ from the global cooperative agreement.

Finding: Missions that scaled up the program used separate agreements because they wanted greater management control and the ability to adapt elements of the model in the global agreement to their needs.

The current CTOs in Sofia and Mexico City emphasized that the mission desire to manage the program was their primary reason for developing a separate agreement with ICMA. Their mission directors wanted primary responsibility to manage the program in their country—the CTO function. A second main reason was their desire to have a longer-term perspective and to fund partnerships that were longer than the typical 18-month period, with the option for renewing them. A third factor was that they could design the program to better fit in with and complement the rest of their local governance strategy, since they had more control over it, and could test a variety of models (e.g., replication phase refunding at a lower level) and include the local intermediary as a full partner (in Bulgaria). Fourth, they included special activities to help document and share innovative practices with other municipalities in the country and to strengthen the local PVO and/or municipal associations.

All the separate agreements built in local association or PVO strengthening and additional dissemination services. USAID missions in Bulgaria and Mexico built continuing relationships with the initial partnerships into their extensions, allowing for refunding them. No previous partnerships existed in Indonesia. The value of the program was recognized by its track record elsewhere. (The Deputy Director of the RUDO, based in Jakarta, had worked with the Zimbabwe partnerships in the past and manages partnerships in other countries in the region.) The new decentralization legislation going into effect on January 1, 2001 was the opportunity that impelled the USAID mission to develop a major program, based on the Resource Cities model, originally with 12 partnerships to be initiated in the first year (now scaled back to 11 over two years). While four partnerships were initiated in Serbia in 2000, efforts were dispersed because of the need to involve third partners in two other countries.

Recommendations to scale up the Resource Cities Partnerships Program in targeted countries

1. *Encourage clustering, supporting several partnerships in one country, and modify the new contract mechanism to encourage missions and operating units to use it rather than setting up separate agreements.*

The clustering approach is recommended as the best way to scale up the program by key supporters of the program in USAID and ICMA who have been with the program from the beginning, as well as by the missions that have initiated it. Clustering allows the partnerships to achieve critical mass, in which participating cities reinforce each other's efforts, and facilitates spreading the innovations or reforms in the country, and so it achieves greater results. This approach also allows missions to better integrate the partnerships with other programs, for example, complementing efforts to strength a local counterpart organization or municipal association. It also enables ICMA to have a staff person in country to move things along during the gaps in between visits when the programs can lose momentum.

Implications for new agreement. If the new contract mechanism (Leader/Associate awards) were to allow the missions the flexibility to design the program to meet their needs, and management control, they would no longer need to bypass the global agreement. These changes, recommended in the previous section, would simultaneously strengthen the partnerships. (See recommendations about duration, refunding, expanding services by and to local intermediaries.) The additional costs would be borne by the mission, as they are now. In the separate agreements, missions allocate far more to the program than for a single partnership (Annex 2). The cost for a mission to buy in to the existing agreement for a single partnership averages \$230,000, somewhat less for Latin American and Eastern European countries due to lower travel costs. The new agreement should allow both kinds of participation.

Advantages/disadvantages. The advantages of including these clusters in a single umbrella agreement include synergies from lessons learned, facilitating better tracking of the program's overall impact and needs, and greater coordination by USAID and ICMA. One benefit would be better documentation and sharing of lessons learned worldwide, a move to the next level from best practices symposia in single countries. The Blagoevgrad participants in the technical twinning program, aware of the national impact their sharing had, recommended that they meet with program participants from other countries working on similar issues so that they could learn from each other. One lamented that "so far there has been no multilateral cooperation in the program." They offered to take their "road show" to other countries and suggested that partnerships from other countries be invited to join them at the ICMA Annual Conference.

Another benefit of expanding the agreement is that the Global Bureau could better fulfill its mandate to lead by being able to share with missions and operating units the full range of options and program benefits.

A benefit for ICMA is that it would not have to compete for each agreement. While the previous global cooperative agreement, and individual agreements in Mexico and Indonesia, were awarded on a non-compete basis, competitive bids, used for Bulgaria and Serbia, are required for the Leader/Associate mechanism.

Missions that currently have separate agreements may not wish to change, fearing a loss of local control. They also might have helpful suggestions for the new global agreement. The CTO should explain the benefits of this clustering approach to individual missions, to encourage them to try it. Also she should provide those who wish to cluster some rationale or incentive to work through the global agreement.

Clustering is not an appropriate strategy for all countries. Missions should be encouraged to initiate a single city-to-city partnership, if that is best for them. Overselling clustering could discourage some missions from participating.

- 2. Use the Resource Partnership model to address the full range of USAID's urban strategy goals. Expanding issue areas addressed by the partnerships to include health, education, and all the agency strategic objectives would enable access to USAID funding in addition to local democracy, US-AEP, and global urban programs allocations.*

The Resource Cities partnerships to date have effectively addressed many, but not all, urban services: urban infrastructure, privatization, financial management, economic development, and strategic planning. Most of the funding of the separate agreements and of the mission buy-in of the recent partnerships has come from the local democracy program since the Resource Cities Partnership program is a clear fit with the program's IR to strengthen local government.

But there is a demand for the program to work on other issues. The head of the municipal education department in Blagoevgrad requested that the same methodology, and work with Auburn, be expanded to education, health, and social welfare programs in a future phase. Her vision was that innovations piloted in Blagoevgrad in these fields would then be disseminated to other cities by FLGR and made national policy—just as the municipal strategic planning, budgeting, marketing, and GIS changes developed in their first phase had national impact.

A mission could fund a new partnership to work on these health, education and/or welfare issues, using the corresponding sources of USAID funds. ICMA might market this approach to US city managers of cities with outstanding health, educational or social welfare programs and they could work with a number of cities in a region.

Another model is to work with an international PVO of local officials working on a particular issue, such as the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives' (ICLEI) Cities for Climate Protection program. ICLEI helped ICMA identify the partners in the Cebu, Philippines-Ft. Collins, Colorado partnership funded by the US-AEP. US-AEP's first aim is to use the partnership to pilot an activity, in this case regarding solid waste management, and then spread it to other cities in the Philippines using the League of Municipalities. Longer term, the model can be used in other areas in which ICLEI and ICMA have active programs. Clusters of partners, within or across countries, could address a common theme. Buy-in could come from a variety of USAID programs.

Implication for new agreement. This is mostly a marketing/promotional issue within USAID and US city managers to set up a demonstration by starting a new partnership working on a health issue such as AIDS.

Advantages/disadvantages. This approach could increase the amount of USAID funds that can be tapped for the Resource Cities program and help recruit new US cities.

US officials take their lead from the local mayors about what problems to tackle, and health and other social or environmental issues may not be their priorities. As Blagoevgrad suggested, partners could move to different issue areas in a re-funding round since much groundwork has been done and this is a logical way to continue the relationship, but this would not add to the number of overseas cities in the program.

3. *Consider pairing one US city with several cities in a selected country to work together on one functional issue area.*

This approach achieves a similar result as clustering in that it increases the number of overseas cities participating in the program. It differs in that there is only one US city involved and so it can be more cost-effective. Auburn, Alabama, and the other US cities are each working to duplicate their efforts in one or two other Bulgarian cities in the replication funding phase. The US city contacts more than one Bulgarian city on each trip, but few of the new Bulgarian city officials will visit the US city.

Several US officials said they thought it was possible to bring the same innovation to multiple cities, with little extra investment of their time, if their partner city (or an intermediary like FLGR) would bring the officials together and help sell the change to its peers. What they were doing in adapting their experience to the first city's needs would work for the others with a similar need, e.g., improved SWM and landfill. One was already adapting a course he taught on municipal financial management at home and the local mayor had invited other officials from the district to attend. Those supporting this recommendation stressed that they would work on one discrete activity or issue, such as improving budgeting, rather than on several as they do now. Several suggested to pilot test the innovation with one city in a traditional partnership and then replicate it in a number of other cities in a second phase.

Implications for new agreement. Greater flexibility about the numbers of exchange visits, funding levels for various activities, and re-funding for replication efforts should be allowed in the new agreement and its application. Such partnerships could cost more than others, if a larger number of overseas officials would make three trips to the US. This might depend on whether this model is chosen for a new partnership or an extension of a former one. The levels of funding of individual components should be expected to vary.

Advantages/disadvantages. "You get more bang for the buck," said one US city official. FLGR emphasized that this approach would also support the mayor initiating the reform because he/she would not be the only one doing it, and improve chances that the change would be implemented and sustained.

A number of the US local officials consulted expressed reservations about this approach, based on their experience. They didn't think they could handle the additional investment of time and resources required to develop the personal relationships in other cities, or they thought that this model would dilute their efforts with their main partner.

One of the officials who liked the idea of working with multiple cities emphasized that much of the learning occurs in the US and drastically reducing the number of trips to the US, as the Bulgarian program elected in Phase III, may be unwise.

4. *Promote greater awareness and use of alternative pairings, including municipal association to municipal association, various city/provincial/state pairs, city or county to metro area, pairings of cities involved in a shared international effort.*

Many USAID staff are unaware of the alternative partnerships that the program has sponsored. Examples are a US state league of municipalities with an overseas country league (Florida-El Salvador; Oregon-Indonesia); cities in one US state with those in an overseas state (Arizona-Jalisco); US city to overseas metro area (Austin, TX –Asuncion and two nearby cities in Paraguay). Three-city partnerships (linking a US city with cities in two countries) were begun to get around a situation where US officials could not travel to Serbia, but developed into collaboration of the US city with two partners. USAID staff suggested linking US cities with those in Eastern European and the former Soviet Union nations in three-city partnerships or US cities with Indian state government departments to facilitate decentralization.

Implications for new agreement. This is also primarily a marketing issue.

Advantages/disadvantages. Twinning associations is a cost-effective way to share information about lessons learned with a number of cities and to strengthen a local intermediary. They can extend impact where funds are limited, but they do not increase the number of partnerships in a country. Other alternatives—pairing clusters of cities in US and overseas states, pairing a US city with an overseas metro area, and pairing a US city with cities in two countries—do increase the number of participating overseas cities.

5. *Promote the new options, including alternative partnership structures, that will be allowed under the new agreement to USAID missions and operating units and to US city managers. ICMA should develop, and USAID fund, a marketing plan to increase the number of US participants and support in the US. Evaluate the lessons learned by the pilot examples of alternative pairings and clustering supported by the Resource Cities program.*

- The global program of USAID and ICMA together should market new options to USAID missions and operating units to encourage them to understand the changes that have been

Another way to “scale up”

The Urban Councils Association of Zimbabwe had served as the support organization for the two previous one-on-one partnerships in the country. It is now paired with the National Forum for Black Public Administrators in a new partnership. This partnership is a cost-effective way to assist many Zimbabwean cities by strengthening their national association.

made and the options that are now possible. One way to encourage more dialogue is for the CTO to share this evaluation with the USAID staff interviewed and seek their feedback.

- ICMA should market these alternative partnership types to US cities and municipal associations to identify a few interested in trying new models. They should tap the offer of several US city managers to help sell the program, either to their peers or to US officials, including those in congress, since they are strong champions of the program. In addition to a panel at the annual ICMA conference, Ft. Collins officials suggested marketing at meetings of the American Planning Association and Colorado Municipal League, as well as those of the National Recycling Association and the Solid Waste Association of North America.
- The current agreement does not allocate funds to market the program to their membership or USAID missions and operating units, so USAID should dedicate funding to help them do this. A new way of paying the contractor should be developed so that on-going functions, such as marketing, information gathering, and reporting, are paid by the Urban Program directly rather than from the buy-in for individual partnerships which vary or from G&A.
- USAID and ICMA should compare results of the various models and identify lessons learned and share them. What are the benefits, constraints, costs, and pre-requisite conditions for effective association pairing, county/metro area partnerships, and having a single city work with several in one or more countries on a functional area compared to stand-alone partnerships and clustering of the city-to-city partnerships in a country?

Implications for new agreement. The RFP for the new agreement should request a marketing plan and budget for this function.

Advantages/disadvantages. Increased number of buy-ins by USAID missions and operating units and more partnerships of all kinds will result from effective marketing. Materials to support such marketing efforts need to be researched and developed, as do work plans and budgets. This will add to program administration costs.

6. *Initiate a program to identify and share lessons learned by all the partnerships, across countries, and share these lessons with USAID missions/operating units and participating cities.*

Sharing lessons learned internationally can be accomplished by expanding the best practices symposium to include local officials from more than one country.

- Symposia can be designed for partners from several countries *in a region*. The RUDOs could take the lead in preparing these regional symposia. An example is a symposium held in South Africa in 1999: a booklet of case studies of seven partnerships was prepared. Each case focused on a different issue: community based development, improved financial management, micro-enterprise development, managing for economic growth, the business of waste management, capacity building and privatization of water services.

- The global office can organize best practices symposia *on specific topics*, such as those listed above, and invite partners who worked on it. Each symposium could follow the usual format—sharing experiences and lessons learned and documenting results of individual partnership efforts—and build upon this to reach some general conclusions and recommendations for future partnerships. The participants might also make policy recommendations for national governments, donors, PVOs, etc.
- Prior to these lessons learned symposia on selected topics, the global office could ask CDIE to conduct “desk reviews” of the documentation available on the Resource City experience in five or six topic areas, such as those listed above. The desk reviews would contain an analysis of the partnerships’ efforts and patterns in their approaches and results. The report would be sent to symposia participants in advance.

These reports and symposia proceedings should be shared with new partnerships focusing on related topics. They should also be used to develop marketing materials (to share with USAID and US city managers) and to enhance the urban programs’ reporting on its accomplishments.

Implications for new agreement. Provide the option for a representative of each partnership city to attend an international symposium. Consider ICMA role in assisting with desk reviews and sponsoring symposia.

Advantages/disadvantages. Wider sharing of program accomplishments and teachings would enhance program impact and obtain greater support within USAID, US cities, and in Congress. Access to information from previous partnerships would enhance effectiveness—and speed implementation—of future partnerships.

While adding this activity would increase program costs in the short term, it would increase revenues in the long-term. Travel costs increases could be moderated if these symposia were coordinated with other visits. For example, some Bulgarian partners are coordinating exchange visits to US cities with the ICMA national conference; they will meet together the day before the conference.

Which countries to target? Characteristics that facilitate scaling up

Analyzing the experience of the Resource Cities program scaling up in Bulgaria, Mexico and Indonesia, we can identify several major factors that all came together: an external opportunity; USAID resources and support; an interested local support organization; and ICMA’s capitalizing on the opportunity that these conditions presented. So for the global program to incorporate the lessons of success it should:

1. Read the signs of the times.

Sometimes the historical moment involves a major re-alignment in the roles and responsibilities of local officials, such as the new opportunities after the “changes” in Eastern Europe and Russia in the early- to mid-1990s. This change in municipal responsibilities is the key element to consider in the analyzing the external environment while preparing a strategic plan for the

program (i.e., “opportunities” in the SWOT analysis). Constitutional and political changes in Mexico, Indonesia, and Serbia resulted in a major new effort in these countries to institute “decentralization.” ICMA took the initiative, often by submitting unsolicited proposals to initiate the Resource Cities program in these places, at the propitious moment. Choosing the right time and place is a matter of understanding the unique contribution that the RC program can make—how the pragmatic approach of US officials can help facilitate change—as well as that situation is ripe for change. There are other possibilities: India’s 74th Constitutional Amendment mandated decentralization and it is gradually being implemented.

- 2. Analyze carefully the resources available to the USAID mission or operating unit, identify champions within USAID, and identify intersections of strategic choices of the mission or operating unit and the core competency—and competitive advantage—of the program.*

Scaling up is not for all countries; some lack the resources or interest. Considering the minimum three-year time frame to initiate and conclude a partnership, it is important to consider the USAID “graduation date” of countries as well. The reduced funding for the RUDOs requires a reconsideration of their role in the program. The recent growth in the Resource Cities program has primarily been through the local democracy program funding. The CTO and ICMA should analyze USAID funding areas and select those areas that share the same goals as the Resource Cities program. For example, the CTO should identify all countries with IR 2.2 as a priority goal in their strategic plan and the time period of that plan.

Equally important is to look at how the Resource Cities program fits with the mission’s other priorities. Most USAID staff interviewed wanted the program to be integrated with the rest of their work. It would be helpful for the Urban Office and CTO to analyze all the Intermediate Results, in addition to 2.2, strengthening local government globally, that the program can support well. The first such analysis was done of the health sector. It could be done selectively, one sector at a time, and coordinated with a marketing plan for ICMA to recruit new partnerships in each sector over a two-year period, for example.

Just as identifying a “champion” among mayors is key to the success of a partnership, finding champions in USAID are key to its scaling up in selected countries. RUDO staff still have a role to play in marketing, if not funding, the program.

These criteria could be used to create a short list of missions that could be targeted for a pitch on starting an initial partnership or scaling up.

Several persons emphasized that it was essential to better document successes and share them with USAID, to sell the program to USAID.

3. *Provide funds for ICMA to work with a counterpart organization, either a municipal association or non-profit support organization with strong interest in collaborating, and develop ways to strengthen it.*

Scaling up is complemented by delegating partnership management and dissemination functions to another group. The experience of Bulgaria is successful because the local NGO developed its capacity over four years with ICMA's assistance. The staff have real "ownership" of the program and have been very creative in adapting it. Their increased capacity has paid off for USAID/Sofia who has entrusted it to run two grant programs. The other separate agreements aim to strengthen the municipal associations as well as engage them in the partnership effort and to disseminate results.

If the municipal associations are based in political parties, as they are in Bulgaria and Mexico, weak, or not interested, it is important to identify a non profit organization as a local counterpart that can sustain the work in-between exchange visits and, hopefully, after the partnership ends. When a country has "scaled up" and has several on-going partnerships, it is possible to have resident ICMA staff—persons experienced in municipal government who not only speak the language but also are from the country, preferably. One of their major responsibilities should be to help strengthen the counterpart organization.

USAID's Research and Reference Services of CDIE could undertake a comparative evaluation of the relative success of various approaches to municipal association development, and their impact, and share this with missions and ICMA staff. Alternately, USAID's local governance program could conduct this assessment. Because these associations are important to the sustainability and replicability of the innovations introduced by the Resource Cities partnerships, the program has an interest—if not the primary role—in their development.

In conclusion, many of these recommendations reinforce each other. They are all based on an analysis of the concerns and recommendations of the stakeholders consulted for this evaluation.

Annex 1: Resource Cities Partnerships

ROUND ONE--May 1997

Quetzaltenango, Guatemala
Quito, Ecuador
Cochin, India
Lusaka, Zambia
Johannesburg, South Africa
Manzini & Mbabane, Swaziland

Albuquerque, New Mexico
San Jose, California
Charleston, South Carolina
Dayton, Ohio
Houston, Texas
Durham & Winston-Salem, North Carolina

June 1997

Stara Zagora, Bulgaria*
Haskovo, Bulgaria*
Rousse, Bulgaria*
Novgorod, Russia
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa
Capetown, South Africa
Ocotlan, Mexico*
Zapotlan el Grande, Mexico*
Sayula, Mexico*
Zapotlanejo, Mexico*
Lagos de Moreno, Mexico*

San Juan de los Lagos, Mexico*

Durham, North Carolina
Abington, Pennsylvania
Duluth, Minnesota
Hartford, Connecticut
Hampton, Virginia
Charlotte, North Carolina
Tempe, Chandler, & Pinal County,
Avondale, Gilbert, & Yuma, Arizona
Avondale, Gilbert, & Yuma, Arizona
Scottsdale, Arizona
Phoenix, Tolleson, & Bullhead City,
Arizona
Phoenix, Tolleson, & Bullhead City,
Arizona

ROUND TWO--September 1998

Asuncion, Paraguay
Sibiu County, Romania
El Salvador Municipal Association
(COMURES)

Mutare, Zimbabwe
Gweru, Zimbabwe
Dobrich, Bulgaria*
Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria*
Razgrad, Bulgaria*
Gabrovo, Bulgaria*

Austin, Texas
Grand Traverse County, Michigan
Florida League of Cities and Florida
City/County Managers' Association
(FCCMA)
Savannah, Georgia
Saginaw, Michigan
Spokane, Washington
Auburn, Alabama
Brunswick, Ohio
Portage, Michigan

ROUND THREE – September 1999

Almaty, Kazakhstan
Pavlodar, Kazakhstan
Naryn, Kyrgyzstan
Cebu, Philippines
Rayong, Thailand
Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
Hai Phong, Vietnam

Tucson, Arizona
Helena, Montana
Great Falls, Montana
Fort Collins, Colorado
Portland, Oregon
Bakersfield, California
Seattle, Washington

Nis, Serbia (Sofia, Bulgaria)
Kragujevac, Serbia (Pitesti, Romania)
Subotica, Serbia (Szeged, Hungary)
Pancevo, Serbia (Timisoara, Romania)

Columbus, Ohio
Springfield, Ohio
Akron, Ohio
Lockland, Ohio

ROUND THREE – May 2000

Veliko Turnovo, Bulgaria**
Pazardjik, Bulgaria**
Vidin, Bulgaria**
Silistra, Bulgaria**

Golden, Colorado
West Bend, Wisconsin
West Carrollton, Ohio
Kettering, Ohio

ROUND THREE -- 2001

Urban Councils Association of Zimbabwe
(UCAZ)
Amman, Jordan
Pasir, Indonesia***
Bekasi, Indonesia***
Balikpapan, Indonesia***
Bitung, Indonesia***
City, county, provincial associations***
(APEKSI, APPSI, APKASI)
TBD, Vietnam
Triana, Albania

National Forum for Black Public
Administrators (NFBPA).
Des Moines, Iowa
Coquill, Oregon
Gresham, Oregon
Tacoma, Oregon
Coos Bay, Oregon
League of Oregon Cities

TBD
TBD

Partnerships without an asterisk were funded under the global cooperative agreement of USAID/G/ENV/UP with ICMA in which the interested mission or USAID unit selects to fund the partnership through an add-on to the Global Bureau's agreement. Serbian partnerships required a secondary partner in a nearby country since Americans were not allowed in Serbia before October 2000.

* Partnerships funded under separate agreements of USAID/Mexico and USAID/Bulgaria with ICMA.

** Phase III of the Bulgarian Technical Twinning Program, under USAID/ICMA SUM Contract, funded these four new partnerships and in October 2000 refunded four of the previous Bulgarian partnerships for a replication phase: Gabrovo- Portage, MI; Blagoevgrad-Auburn, AL; Razgrad/Brunswick, OH; and Haskovo-Abingdon, PA.

***Five of 11 partnerships to be funded in the USAID/Jakarta cooperative agreement with ICMA.

Annex 2: Current USAID Funding of ICMA Resource City Partnerships

1. Global cooperative agreement with ICMA
Resource Cities Cooperative Agreement
Contract number: LAC-A-OO-00020-00
Period: September 7, 1999 – September 6, 2001
Contract ceiling: \$3,803,149
Modification: September 7, 2001 – September 6, 2004
Extension ceiling: \$9,226,225
Average partnership cost: \$230,000

2. Bulgaria Indefinite Quantity Contract/Task Order
USAID/ICMA Sustainable Urban Management Contract
Contract number: LAG –I-00-99-00008-00, Task Order 807
Bulgarian Technical Twinning Program, Phase III
Period: May 25, 2000 – May 24, 2002
Contract ceiling: \$989,827

3. Indonesia cooperative agreement
Local Government Support and Partnership Program consists of the Resource Cities Partnerships and municipal association development
Contract: 497-A-00-00-00044-00
Period: September 28, 2000 - September 30, 2003
Contract ceiling: \$4,649,731 (\$1.8 million for Resource Cities Partnerships)

4. Mexico cooperative agreement
Phase II of the cooperative agreement provides for a small role for Resource Cities partnerships. Past participating cities in the states of Jalisco and Arizona have been invited to renew and the program will expand to two other Mexican states, Campeche and San Luis Potosi. The other program activities are municipal association development, ethics and transparency in democratic local government, local government performance measurement, and information dissemination.
Contract name: *US-Mexico Partnership for Municipal Development*
Contract number: 523-A-00-97-00008-00
Period: Extension (Phase II) October 1, 2000- September 30, 2002
Contract ceiling: \$1,799,755

5. Serbia agreement
Proposals being reviewed by USAID/Serbia, to be awarded soon. Resource Cities program is a part of a much larger Local Governance project.

Annex 3: Task Order

1. BACKGROUND

The Resource Cities cooperative agreement (LAG-A-00-99-00020-00) was awarded to the International City/County Managers' Association (ICMA) in September 1998 through September 2001 to assist USAID promote more effective local governments (G/ENV's IR 2.2) around the globe.

The Resource Cities program facilitates the exchange of teams of local government officials - city managers, mayors, and department heads - between US and overseas cities for a period of 18-24 months. These exchanges provide an opportunity for officials to learn directly from their peers and to apply these pragmatic, field-tested approaches to their urban management challenges. The team of city officials concentrates on two or three discreet issues during the 18-month USAID funded partnership. The technical focus of each partnership is driven by the demands and needs of the targeted overseas cities, and in the past has addressed areas such as solid waste management, organizational development, revenue generation, budgeting, historic preservation, downtown revitalization, and water and wastewater treatment. An emphasis is placed on the design of a discrete work plan for the partners to follow over the course of their relationship, with objectives and expected outcomes agreed upon by both. In the past, this collaboration has helped partnerships make significant changes in urban management overseas.

Under the Resource Cities cooperative agreement, 24 city partnerships have been initiated. A partnership is established when an interested Mission or USAID unit selects to fund one through an add-on to the Global Bureau's cooperative agreement. Nor to the cooperative agreement, the Office of Environment and Urban Programs in cooperation with participating USAID operating units funded Resource Cities partnerships through delivery orders under the MDM Requirements contract with ICMA.

This evaluation asks (1) what possible improvements in the program design, implementation, and management of Resource Cities would facilitate scaling up in targeted countries? (2) in what ways can Resource Cities enhance impact, influence policy, and achieve enduring change? (3) how can Resource Cities improve and measure sustainability of the project results as well as the partnership?

2. PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

This evaluation will be used in identifying how the program design could be improved. The evaluation will provide specific recommendations for ways that Resource Cities can begin scaling up in targeted countries. Furthermore, the evaluation will propose ways that Resource Cities can be made more effective and responsive to operating unit needs, and where possible and appropriate, less costly and better targeted.

3. EVALUATION METHOD

Rapid Appraisal Method

Task 1 - Collect and Review Materials: The consultant will assemble and review relevant documents including the program design, annual reports, quarterly reports, trip reports, and other relevant material as appropriate. The consultant will reference the literature review done by the USAID Research team on twinning programs.

Task 2 - Conduct Background Interviews: The consultant will conduct informal background interviews with key ICMA and G/ENV/UP staff.

Task 3 - Conduct Customer Feedback Telephone Interviews: The consultant will prepare a customer feedback questionnaire, field test and modify it, and use the questionnaire to systematically collect information about Resource Cities partnerships. The customer is defined as both USAID operating unit staff, who funded the Resource Cities partnership, as well as, the participating city officials. Five Resource Cities partnerships with a minimum of three telephone interviews each will be targeted.

The customer feedback should address a range of questions, including, but not limited to: understanding why some Resource Cities partnerships were followed by a scaled up version with multiple partnerships in the country; the fit between customer need and service provision; sustainability; quality of training; extent of follow-up; and overall "satisfaction" with ICMA. Such questions might include:

Understanding Key Factors Influencing the Decision to Scale-up Resource Cities

- What are the factors in-country that make scaling up of Resource Cities more feasible, and thus, probable?
- What were the pivotal factors that influenced the USAID operating unit to scale-up Resource Cities?
- What implementation/management issues should be resolved in order to scale-up the program?
- What are the best ways to communicate with USAID operating units about the applicability and availability of the Resource Cities program?
- What are the lessons learned that illustrate successful methodologies for scaling-up?

Success of Resource Cities partnerships

- Did Resource Cities partnerships achieve their stated goals?
- Was the technical assistance provided useful to the foreign partner city?
- Were USAID operating units' expectations for the Resource Cities partnership met? Were partner cities expectations met?
- How would you rate ICMA's responsiveness to USAID operating units? To partner cities?
- How would you rate ICMA's ability to deal with unexpected events?

Sustainability

- To what extent did the partnership results and/or the communication between partners continue after donor funding ended?
- Have foreign cities adopted the lessons learned as part of their organizational process?
- Are the lessons learned replicated in other city departments and/or in other cities?

- How well is information disseminated to peer cities in the host country? Is the Best Practices Symposium a valuable and efficacious means of disseminating information?
- Have the partner cities continued a productive relationship beyond the 18 months of USAID funding?

The consultant will prepare a schedule for such feedback interviews and a survey plan to efficiently cull this information. The consultant will draft an analysis plan to show how feedback will be examined.

Task 4 - Conduct Key Informant Interviews:

The consultant will prepare a customer feedback questionnaire and use it to collect information about a Resource Cities partnership in the field. The customer is defined as both USAID operating unit staff, who funded the Resource Cities partnership, as well as, the participating city officials. The consultant will travel to one Resource Cities site (TBD) to conduct face-to-face interviews with USAID staff and participating city officials, including where possible those who attended the Best Practices Symposium.

The customer feedback should address a range of questions similar to those specified above.

Task 5 - Recommendations; Based on completion of Tasks 1 through 4, the consultant will prepare a Final Report, which recommends ways to improve the program design, implementation, and management of Resource Cities in order to facilitate scaling up in targeted countries. Recommendations will also address ways to improve and measure sustainability of the project results as well as the partnership. Finally, the consultant will suggest ways Resource Cities can enhance impact, influence policy, and achieve enduring change.

Each recommendation must be directly tied to facts revealed in the interviews. As a whole, recommendations should be ranked from the most critical to the least important. Recommendations may vary widely. The underlying purpose of all recommendations must be to improve Resource Cities, so as to better realize the intent and purposes of the program. Any recommendations must detail how the proposed change would better help USAID achieve its Intermediate Result 2.2, more effective local governance, as well as, estimate the associated costs with the recommendation (if any) and administrative Consequences that would follow.

4. TEAM COMPOSITION AND PARTICIPATION

Consultant TBD

Jon Bormet Director, Resource Cities

Faye Haselkorn, LGUD, USAID (?)

Alison Paijit, Team Leader, USAID

5. SCHEDULE AND LOGISTICS

6. REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION REQUIREMENTS

The contractor shall develop a draft report that addresses the aforementioned objectives and tasks. Within 10 days of receipt of the comments and suggestions from USAID, the contractor

shall finalize the draft report and submit seven copies of the report. The contractor shall submit the report in hard copy and on diskette in a Microsoft Word format to:

Alison Paijit
IR 2.2 Team Leader
USAID
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
RRB 3.08
Washington, DC 20523

An electronic copy of the final report must be sent to CDIE:
Docsubmit@cdie.org

The final report shall include but not be limited to:

- Recommendations for scaling-up the benefits of Resource Cities partnerships and improving sustainability.
- Analysis and description of the manner in which Resource Cities may be improved.
- Suggestions for reinforcing and promoting achievement of partnership objectives as well as sustainability of benefits and activities post-funding.

IMPORTANT

This task order calls for the Contractor to furnish important services in support of evaluation of the Resource Cities cooperative agreement (LAG-A-00-99-00020-00). In accordance with the principles of FAR Subpart 9.5 and USAID policy, **THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE INELIGIBLE TO FURNISH, AS A PRIME OR SUBCONTRACTOR OR OTHERWISE, IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES UNDER ANY CONTRACT OR TASK ORDER THAT RESULTS IN RESPONSE TO FINDINGS, PROPOSALS, OR RECOMMENDATIONS IN AN EVALUATION REPORT WRITTEN BY THE CONTRACTOR. THIS PRECLUSION WILL APPLY TO ANY SUCH AWARDS MADE WITHIN 18 MONTHS OF USAID ACCEPTING THE REPORT,** unless the Head of the Contracting Activity, in consultation with USAID's Competition Advocate, authorizes a waiver (in accordance FAR 9.503) determining that preclusion of the Contractor from the implementation work would not be in the Government's interest.

Annex 4: Documents Reviewed

Project Materials

ICMA

1. Resource Cities Packet
2. Resource Cities Program – Application
3. List of Partnerships
4. Summaries of Past Partnerships (13)
5. *International Resource Cities Program Case Studies* (7 in southern Africa), Cape Town, 11th-12 November 1999.
6. Melissa Speed. April 17, 200. *Resource Cities: An Initiative for Making Cities Work Quarterly Performance Report, First Quarter 2001*. (w/o financial information, from www.dec.org)
7. ICMA. *Asuncion-Paraguay Resource Cities Partnership Summary Report*, Delivery Order #36. *Impact Assessment*.

USAID

8. Making Cities Work: Resource Cities (one page flyer)
9. List of Resource Cities—Rounds One, Two, and Three
10. Resource Cities Cooperative Agreement Summary
11. How to Use the Cooperative Agreement: A Guide for Missions and Bureaus
12. *Resource Cities: An Initiative For Making Cities Work: Program Description*
13. Rodney W. Johnson. May 14, 1999. *Contract Information Bulletin* 99-10. Leader/Associate Assistance Instruments.
14. USAID. February 2001. *Making Cities Work: USAID's Urban Strategy: An Initiative Launched by the Administrator and Prepared by the Urbanization Task Force*. (www.makingcitieswork.org).

Related Evaluations

15. Molly Davis, CDIE Research Analyst. May 24, 2001. *Effectiveness of Twinning Programs* memo. USAID.
16. Faye Haselkorn, E&E/DG/LGUD. March 28, 2000. *Lessons Learned in Local Partnerships* paper. USAID.
17. Camille Cates Barnett, PhD, and Patrick Urich, consultants to ICMA. November-December, 1999. *FLGR/ICMA Bulgarian Technical Twinning Program: Phase II Assessment Report*. USAID.
18. Unknown. June 1999. *Municipal and Community Problem Solving Program Evaluation*. Sister Cities International and US Information Agency.
19. Federation of Canadian Municipalities, International Office. 2000: excerpts on lessons learned from Czech-Canada Municipal Management Project and from FCM submission to CIDA. 1999: 16 evaluative case studies from CIDA evaluation.
20. Martti Lariola, Sven Ohlund, Bengt Hakansson, and Indulis Emsis. 1999. *Twinning Cooperation between Riga Water Company and Stockholm Water Company*. SIDA Evaluation 00/7.

21. Borje Wallberg. 2000. *Twinning Cooperation between Swedish and Bosnian Municipalities*. SIDA Evaluation 00/15.
22. Process Consulting Company. 2000. *Sustaining Partnerships into the Next Century (SPAN) Project: Mid-term Evaluation Report*. USAID/Russia.
23. Stark Biddle, Michael Kott and Elke Ender, Academy for Educational Development. 2000. *Durable Partnerships: Phase II – Desk Study*. USAID.
24. Chanya Charles and C. Stark Biddle, Academy for Educational Development. May 2001. *Designing and Managing Partnerships Between U.S. and Host-Country Entities*. USAID/CDIE.

Other

25. Federation of Canadian Municipalities, International Office. 1997. *Municipal Partnerships and General Information and FCM International Newsletter*.
26. Douglas J. Watson. 2001. "Public Managers Abroad: In Their Own Words." *Public Management*, ICMA, 83:5, 14-16.
27. Douglas J. Watson. 2000. "The International Resource Cities Program: Building Capacity in Bulgarian Local Governments." *Public Administration Review*. Sept/October. 6:5, 457-463.
28. Foundation for Local Government Reform. 2000. *Annual Report 2000*.
29. Foundation for Local Government Reform. 2000. *Special Digest Edition of Newsletter*. Digest of most interesting articles of past year, fifth anniversary.
30. Charles Fenyvesi and Edward von Kloberg, "Your Majesty, Your Balkans Await You." *The Washington Post*. July 19, 2001. Outlook section, B1-B4.
31. John Tagliabue. "A Bet on Bulgaria Pays Dividends; Plants Like American Standard's Bolster the Economy." *The New York Times*. July 18, 2001.
32. Peter Hessler. "Letter from Mongolia. The Nomad Vote: Campaigning in the land of Genghis Khan." *The New Yorker*. July 16, 2001. 58-65.

Annex 5: Informal Background Interviews

Name	Title/Program	Org./ City	Date	Type	Relation to Program
USAID					
Danielle Arigoni	Development, Community and Economics Div.	EPA, DC	6/13/01	Phone	Former CTO of global cooperative agreement
Gary Bland	Decentralization Spc., Democracy & Governance	USAID/ Global, DC	6/14/01	Phone	Observer, especially of Mexico program
Viviann Gary	Director E&E	USAID, DC	6/13/01	Phone	Urban Programs Director when RC program began
Angelina Gurkina		USAID/ Moscow	7/11/01	Phone	Hartford, CT - Novgorod, Russia
Jeremy Hagger	Project Officer, ANE	USAEP, DC	6/19/01 6/28/01	Phone	Contact for 2 AEP funded partnerships
Joel Kolker	Director, RUDO/Sub- Saharan Office	USAID/ Pretoria	6/18/01	Phone	5 years experience with program in southern Africa
Sonny Low and Rolando Quinonez	Deputy Director, Project Dev. Specialist, RUDO/LAC	USAID/ Guatemala City	7/10/01	Phone	Albuquerque, NM- Quetzaltenango, Guatemala partnership
Jessica McKenna	RUDO Deputy Director	USAID/ Jakarta	7/31/01	Phone	CTO, Indonesia cooperative agreement
Ted Priftis	Local Governance	USAID, DC	6/19/01	Phone	Manages Eastern European partnerships
Kaye Pyle	Representative, El Salvador	InterAmeri- can Fdtn, Arlington, VA	6/14/01	Phone	Contractor to USAID/Bulgaria 1998-2000
James Stein	Deputy Director RUDO	USAID/ New Delhi	8/20/01	Written	Managed Chocin- Charleston, SC partnership
Kathryn Stratos	Moving to Global Development Center, DC	USAID/ Almaty	6/19/01	Phone	Managed partnerships in Kazakhstan & Kyrgyzstan (Naryn)

ICMA					
Mark Bidus	Director, Intl Municipal Programs	ICMA, DC	6/19/01	Phone	Involved since inception
Isabelle Bully- Omcitin	Director, Latin American Programs	ICMA, DC	6/19/01	Phone	Managed early partnerships, not Mexico
Deborah Kimble	Senior Advisor	ICMA, DC	6/13/01	Phone	Former director of RC program; does diagnostics
Amanda Lonsdale	Program Manager	ICMA, Jakarta	6/21/01	phone	Manages Indonesia partnerships

Annex 6: Interview Questions

For Participating US Cities

Alison Pajit of USAID's Office of Environment and Urban Programs in Washington, DC asked me to interview you for an evaluation of the Resource Cities program. The purposes of the evaluation are:

- to identify how the program design can be improved and
- to formulate specific recommendations to help increase the number of cities participating in the program in selected countries.

The recommendations will be based primarily on interviews of key persons in five partnership cities, including yours, and on information gained in an on-site visit to Bulgaria, a country with seven partnerships.

Action Needed. Please reply to this email indicating the best time for me to call you to discuss these questions. This interview should be completed **no later than July 17**.

The questions I would like to discuss with you are:

1. How long have you been involved with the Resource Cities program and to what extent?
2. How successful has your partnership been in meeting its objectives and your expectations and those of your partner city?
 - Has the innovation or reform that was implemented by your partnership been disseminated and replicated in other cities in _____? If so, please explain.
 - Do you believe that the partnership will continue after USAID funding ends? If not, why not? If so, how?
3. What are the main reasons your city decided to participate in the Resource Cities program?
 - How responsive has the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) been to your concerns and those of your partner city? How responsive has (name of counterpart, where applicable) been?
 - How involved has USAID staff in _____ been in your program?
 - Are the 18 to 24 months of USAID funding a sufficient amount of time to achieve the purpose of your partnership?
4. What are your recommendations to:
 - improve the Resource Cities program and
 - increase the number of U.S. cities and overseas cities participating in it?

For example, the Resource Cities Program is considering a model that would allow three to six cities to pair with one U.S. city or service district to work on sector issues such as solid waste management, water, waste water, economic development, budgeting, or health/HIV/AIDS. This would facilitate cooperation by cities regionally and allow more cities to be involved. What do you think of this proposed model? Are there other models that would allow you to better meet your goals?

Interview Questions for Participating Overseas Cities

Alison Pajit of USAID's Office of Environment and Urban Programs in Washington, DC asked me to contact you for an evaluation of the Resource Cities program. The purposes of the evaluation are:

- to identify how the program design can be improved and
- to formulate specific recommendations to help increase the number of cities participating in the program in selected countries.

The recommendations will be based primarily on information from surveys of key persons in five partnership cities, including yours, and from an on-site visit to Bulgaria, a country with seven partnerships.

Action Needed. Please reply to the questions below and return them to me by email **no later than July 17**. Alternately, we can discuss these questions by telephone. If so, please suggest a good time for me to call you for a phone interview, and the number I should call. The questions are:

1. How long have you been involved with the Resource Cities program and to what extent?
2. How successful has your partnership been in meeting its objectives and your expectations and those of your partner city?
 - Has the innovation or reform that was implemented by your partnership been disseminated and replicated in other cities in _____? If so, please explain.
 - Do you believe that your partnership with the U.S. city will continue after USAID funding ends? If not, why not? If so, how?
3. What are the main reasons your city decided to participate in the Resource Cities program?
 - How responsive has the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) been to your concerns and those of your partner city? How responsive has (name of counterpart, where applicable) been?
 - How involved has the USAID staff in _____ been in your program?
 - Are the 18 to 24 months of USAID funding a sufficient amount of time to achieve the purpose of your partnership?
4. What are your recommendations to:
 - improve the Resource Cities program and
 - increase the number of cities in _____ participating in it?

For example, the Resource Cities Program is considering a model that would allow three to six cities to pair with one U.S. city or service district to work on sector issues such as solid waste management, water, waste water, economic development, budgeting, or health/HIV/AIDS. This would facilitate cooperation by cities regionally and allow more cities to be involved. What do you think of this proposed model? Are there other models that would allow you to better meet your goals?

Interview Questions for USAID Missions

Alison Pajit of USAID's Office of Environment and Urban Programs in Washington, DC asked me to contact you for an evaluation of the Resource Cities program. The purposes of the evaluation are:

- to identify how the program design can be improved and
- to formulate specific recommendations to help increase the number of cities participating in the program in selected countries.

The recommendations will be based on interviews of key persons in five partnership cities, an on-site visit to Bulgaria, a country with seven partnerships, and on feedback from USAID staff of missions or programs with at least one Resource Cities partnership.

Action Needed. Please reply to this email indicating the best time for me to call you to discuss these questions and the number that I should call. This interview should be completed **no later than July 17**. The questions I would like to discuss with you are:

1. Please describe your involvement with the _____ Resource Cities partnership.
2. Why did you and/or your mission/program decide to participate in the Resource Cities program?
 - Have you considered expanding the Resource Cities program to other cities? What are the main reasons for this decision?
 - How responsive has the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) been to your concerns and those of your partnership cities? (name of counterpart, where applicable)? USAID/Washington, if applicable?
 - Is the Resource Cities contracting mechanism (currently a cooperative agreement, previously a Municipal Development and Management (MDM) contract) helpful, a barrier, or irrelevant to your participation in the program?
3. How successful has the Resource Cities partnership in _____ been in meeting its objectives? To what degree has it helped achieve your mission's intermediate results?
 - Has the innovation or reform implemented by the partnership been disseminated and replicated in other cities in _____? Please explain.
 - To what extent did the partnership continue after USAID funding ended? Or, if the funding is ongoing, do you think that the partnership will continue?
4. What are your recommendations to:
 - improve the Resource Cities program and
 - increase the number of cities participating in it in selected countries?

For example, the Resource Cities Program is considering a model that would allow three to six cities to pair with one U.S. city or service district to work on sector issues such as solid waste management, water, waste water, economic development, budgeting, or health/HIV/AIDS. This would facilitate cooperation by cities regionally and allow more cities to be involved. What do you think of this proposed model? Are there other models that would allow you to better meet your goals?

Annex 7: Customer Interviews: Five Partnership Cities

Name	Title	Org./City	Date	Type
<i>Cebu, Philippines – Fort Collins, Colorado</i>				
Greg Byrne	Director Community Planing and Environmental Services	Ft. Collins	7/10/01	phone
Susie Gordon	Environmental Program Manager	Ft. Collins	7/10/01	phone
Jose Guisadio	City Government Department Head III, Dept of Planning and Development	Cebu, Philippines	7/19/01	written
Robert MacLeod	Energy Office, Global Environment Center	USAID/ Washington	7/12/01	phone
Joseph Batac	Senior Technical Coordinator	League of Municipalities of Philippines, Manila	7/18/01	phone
Pamela Gallares-Oppus	Regional Manager	ICLEI, Manila	7/26/01	written
<i>Rayong, Thailand – Portland, Oregon</i>				
Tim Grewe	Chief Administrative Officer	Portland	7/17/01	phone
Ruth Roth	Bureau of Financial Planning	Portland	7/17/01	phone
Ken Rust	Director, Management and Finance	Portland	7/17/01	phone
Suraphong Phutanpiboon	Mayor	Rayong	7/15/01	written
Jack Kneeland	Director US-AEP, Thailand	AEP Bangkok	7/25/01	written
Kitti Kumpeera	AEP Representative in Thailand	AEP Bangkok	7/17/01	written
Poonsiri Luekuna	Deputy Director, Environment	Kenan Institute Asia, Bangkok	7/17/01	written

<i>Naryn, Kyrgyzstan – Great Falls, Montana</i>				
John Lawton	City Manager	Great Falls	7/5/01	phone
Coleen Balzarini	Comptroller	Great Falls	7/5/01	phone
Asanbek Kermakunovich	Mayor	Naryn	7/19/01	written
Will Melara	Democracy staff	USAID/ Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan	7/9/01, 7/10/01	phone
<i>Kragujevac, Serbia -- Pitesti, Romania – Springfield, Ohio</i>				
Matt Kridler	City Manager	Springfield	7/12/01	phone
Dobrica Milovanovic	Vice President, City Assembly	Kragujevac	8/7/01	written
Jim Gordon	Senior Public Administration Advisor	USAID/ Romania, Bucharest	7/26/01	written
<i>Zapotlanejo, Mexico – Scottsdale, Arizona</i>				
Barbara Burns	Assistant City Manager	Scottsdale	6/29/01	written
Jose Rubio—contact for Jose Luis Cardona	Mayor	Zapotlanejo	7/16/01	written
Jill Pike	Director, Local Governance Program	USAID/ Mexico City	7/9/01	phone
Octavio Chavez	Resident Advisor	ICMA/ Mexico City	7/26/01	written

Annex 8: Bulgarian Partnership Interviews

Name	Title	Org./City	Date	Type
US City Partners				
Tom Conway (Haskovo Partnership)	City Manager	Abington, PA	7/5/01	phone
Dennis Durham (Gabrovo Partnership)	Assistant City Manager	Portage, MI	7/9/01	phone
Skip Trimble (Razgrad Partnership)	City Manager	Brunswick, OH	7/11/01	phone
Doug Watson (Blagoevgrad Partnership)	City Manager	Auburn, AL	8/7/01	phone
FLGR				
Ginka Kapitanova	Executive Director	FLGR, Sofia	7/23/01	group
Ina Raycheva	Twinning Program Manager	FLGR, Sofia	7/23/01 7/27/01	group
Antoaneta Mateeva	Twinning Program Specialist,	FLGR, Sofia	7/23/01 7/27/01	group
Nevena Kaneva	Program Assistant	FLGR, Sofia	7/23/01	group
USAID				
Kiril Kiryakov	Local Government Advisor, CTO	USAID/ Sofia	7/23/01 7/27/01	group
Thomas Potocki	Senior Local Government Advisor	USAID/ Sofia	7/23/01	group
John Morgan	Local Government Advisor	USAID/ Sofia	7/27/01	group
ICMA				
Judit Deilinger	Program Manager for Europe International Municipal Programs	ICMA/ Budapest	7/28/01	individual
Bulgarian City Partners				
Venelin Ouzunov	Mayor	Municipality of Razgrad	7/23/01	group
Liubomir Tconevev	Deputy Mayor	Municipality of Razgrad	7/24/01	group
Stanka Angelova	Deputy Mayor	Municipality of Razgrad	7/24/01	group
Ilian Nikolov	Executive Director	Razgrad Center for Economic Development	7/24/01	group

Rumen Rashev	Mayor	Municipality of Veliko Turnovo	7/24/01	group
Mina Ilieva	General Secretary, twinning coordinator	Municipality of Veliko Turnovo	7/24/01	group
Nicholai Malakov	Chief Expert, Territorial and Town Planning Dept.	Municipality of Veliko Turnovo	7/24/01	group
Stefanka Dimova	Head of Architecture and Town Planning	Municipality of Veliko Turnovo	7/24/01	group
Valentina Mitkova	Chief Expert, Territorial and Town Planning Dept.	Municipality of Veliko Turnovo	7/24/01	group
Nikola Yankov (and 2 others)	Chief, Territorial and Town Planning Dept.	Municipality of Veliko Turnovo	7/24/01	group
Bogomil Belchev	Mayor	Municipality of Gabrovo	7/25/01	group
Galina Vitanova	Head of Mayor's Office	Municipality of Gabrovo	7/25/01	group
Violeta Parashkenova	Head of Territorial and Town Planning	Municipality of Gabrovo	7/25/01	group
Evelina Penkova	Former press attache of the city, PR officer	Municipality of Gabrovo	7/25/01	group
Stefan Danailov	Mayor	Municipality of Tryavna	7/25/01	group
Petar Vassiler	Deputy Mayor	Municipality of Tryavna	7/25/01	group
RobertNenchev Dzambazov	Secretary	Municipality of Tryavna	7/25/01	group
Viktor Assiisky	Deputy Mayor	Municipality of Blagoevgrad	7/26/01	group
Ventzeslav Kojuharov	Chief Municipal Secretary	Municipality of Blagoevgrad	7/26/01	group
Vanya Chobanova	Head, Economic Development Dept	Municipality of Blagoevgrad	7/26/01	group
Velichka Kainakchieva	Chief Expert, Education Dept.	Municipality of Blagoevgrad	7/26/01	group
Ivan Novoselsky	Chief of municipal firm, town cleaning	Municipality of Blagoevgrad	7/26/01	group
Georgi Ivanov	Mayor	Municipality of Haskovo	7/27/01	written

Pavlina Paseva	Project Coordinator, Business Center	Municipality of Haskovo	7/27/01	written
Krustina Mandazhieva	Administrative Director	Municipality of Haskovo	7/27/01	written
Raina Yovcheva	Executive Assistant	Maritsa Reg.Assoc.of Municipalities, Haskovo	7/27/01	written