Urban Resilience Sector Guidance:
Governance

This document is a companion to the USAID Urban Resilience Technical Guidance, and aims to support USAID staff and implementing partners to develop activities that strengthen urban resilience in governance sector programming and to consider integrated programming that combines multiple sectors such as environment, private sector engagement, and health to connect governance work with other domains of urban resilience. This guidance includes:

- overview of challenges and opportunities when working on governance and urban resilience;
- descriptions of USAID's urban resilience building blocks;
- key questions to apply an urban resilience lens;
- strategies to strengthen urban resilience and examples;
- funding;
- Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) approaches and illustrative performance indicators;
- key resources for additional support.

—

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

There is a **close relationship between good governance and urban resilience.** USAID's Urban Resilience Technical Guidance recognizes this by identifying "strengthening governance" as one of the five cross-cutting approaches to supporting urban resilience in all sectors. A study of 50 cities participating in the United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)'s Making Cities Resilient disaster risk reduction programme found that governance factors are critical.[1] Similarly, a review of 22 global cities participating in the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities program identified specific governance levers that contribute to resilience such as greater use of science and evidence in planning and decision-making, increased internal coordination across silos within city government, empowering resilience champions, and greater vertical and horizontal coordination.[2]

---

[1] Johnson, C, Blackburn, S (2014) Advocacy for urban resilience: UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient campaign. Environment and Urbanization 26(1): 29–52.

[2] On the other hand, political turnover, the size and durability of the bureaucracy, and other capacity indicators were identified to constrain resilience efforts. Martin and McTarnaghan (2018). Institutionalizing Urban Resilience. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/institutionalizing-urban-resilience

By considering urban resilience in democracy, human rights, and governance (DRG) programming where appropriate and relevant, USAID can enhance governance outcomes while supporting partner countries to better prepare for, respond to, and rebound from shocks and stresses.[3] USAID's DRG programming is focused on:[4] Good Governance (including national and local institutions), Civil Society and Independent Media, Democratic Elections and Political Processes, Rule of Law, and Human Rights. Furthermore, since 2012 the USAID DRG Center has promoted a cross-sectoral and integrated approach to programming. Each of these programming areas can contribute to strengthening urban resilience, and at complementary levels of government such as national, provincial/regional, and local.

Acute shocks (e.g., disasters, conflict, pandemics) and chronic stresses (e.g., rising inequality, recurring flooding or drought, food insecurity, violence) on urban populations are increasingly severe, and can contribute to an influx of internally displaced persons (IDPs), conflict, violence or social unrest, as well as damage and loss to the built environment, including infrastructure failure and disruption of basic service delivery. Cities need to be resilient to such emergent challenges to achieve sustainable, inclusive development, and reduce poverty. For cities to maintain functions in the face of shocks and stresses, they must address the underlying vulnerabilities of urban communities through enhancing social, economic, and technical systems and infrastructure.[5] By strengthening inclusive and participatory processes, promoting investment, and by increasing the accountability of governance structures, urban resilience measures can be taken in the governance sector that reflect the needs of populations in vulnerable situations, increase government coordination, and promote public transparency.

> **What is Urban Resilience?**
>
> Urban resilience refers to the ability of urban systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability while positively transforming towards sustainable, equitable, and inclusive development. Shocks and stresses include those from climate change as well as other sources such as rapid urbanization or conflict. Urban systems include people, communities, infrastructure, the natural environment, and cultures, norms, and policies in cities and towns.

BUILDING BLOCKS

The **Urban Resilience Framework** identifies five building blocks to improve urban resilience. These approaches can be applied in a targeted way to governance and other sector programming, as well as across sectors and programmatic focus areas to increase the overall resilience of urban systems to shocks and stresses:

1. **Inclusive Planning**: Planning for resilience necessitates inclusive, democratic, equitable, evidence-based processes that account for future risk. USAID should assist cities in formulating evidence-based plans and actions, in consultation with relevant communities, that holistically address past and future shocks and stresses.

---

[3] See Section III for more discussion of the importance of urban resilience to the sustainable development of USAID partner countries.

[4] From https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID_FY2020_AFR-508.pdf page 35.

[5] Meyer, Natanya & Auriacombe. (2019). Good Urban Governance and City Resilience: An Afrocentric Approach to Sustainable Development. Sustainability. 11. 5514. 10.3390/su11195514.

2. **Governance:** Strengthening urban governance is central to the effective and inclusive delivery of basic services during and after shocks and stresses. This includes strengthening the capacity of cities to improve and enforce land use, zoning and other plans and regulations; improving community engagement; strengthening communication, transparency and accountability; and aligning across the diverse actors and levels (national/subnational) that contribute to urban governance. USAID is well-positioned to help strengthen local governance systems in support of urban resilience.

3. **Finance:** Actions to build resilience often require far more financial resources than city governments can mobilize on their own. USAID should assist with strengthening the financial management capacity (e.g., resource mobilization and use, development of blended finance solutions) of cities and help them unlock financial capital for the physical and social infrastructure needed to support resilience. USAID should also support efforts to increase access to finance at the household level.

4. **Social Capital**: The networks of relationships and bonds within and across individuals, communities and institutions enable societies to function effectively. USAID should examine what relationships are important for leveraging social capital in the face of stresses and shocks, and identify relationships that could be strengthened to increase social capital, especially those that promote diverse groups of community members working together and helping each other when crisis hits..

5. **Natural Capital** - Restore and protect the natural systems that can contribute to resilience. Natural capital and environmental assets—including open space, forests, biodiversity, and wetlands, both inside and outside of the city's boundaries— can provide protection from shocks and stresses. They should be restored and protected. USAID should promote the use of nature-based solutions to improve resilience, including urban green infrastructure.

> **What risks to consider?**
>
> Identifying potential risks to urban systems may be a daunting task, but USAID officers can benefit from a variety of useful external resources when undertaking a risk assessment. For example:
>
> ThinkHazard!, the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)'s web-based tool for developing countries, has identified 11 natural hazards (river flood, urban flood, coastal flood, earthquake, landslide, tsunami, volcano, cyclone, water scarcity, extreme heat, and wildfire).
>
> Lloyd's City Risk Index includes 18 threats. In addition to the natural hazards included in Think Hazard!, it includes risks such as pandemics, terrorism, sovereign default, and cyber attack.

KEY QUESTIONS TO IDENTIFY AND ASSESS OPPORTUNITIES

The questions below are based on the *Key Questions and Opportunities* section of the **Urban Resilience Technical Guidance**. Reviewing these questions and considerations can help to identify resilience needs, assets at risk, key stakeholders, and opportunities which, when considered together, may inform a programmatic approach. Analysis can also help identify, understand, and prioritize the urban geographic area(s) that programming will cover, which may include secondary cities, growing towns, or even rural/urban corridors in addition to larger, consolidated cities.

Resilience to what?

- What are the primary **shocks** – e.g., flooding, cyberattack, conflict, extreme heat, pandemics – in the targeted urban areas? What are chronic **stresses**, like income inequality, insufficient transportation services, and limited communications networks?[6]
- What existing **risk assessments** relating to resilience and urban governance are available? (For example, climate risks that were identified as part of the CDCS Climate Risk Assessment, a conflict assessment, and/or has the city advanced its own resilience planning effort?) Has a self-assessment been done, such as one using the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)'s Local Government Self Assessment Tool? What additional data is needed to understand specific risks in relevant urban areas? (see text box).
- What resources (such as financial), and assets (such as technical, natural and social capital) are available to local governments and other stakeholders?
- Of the identified resources and assets, which are at greater risk? What specific considerations need to be made for those groups and locations in the most vulnerable situations?

Resilience for whom?

- How can interventions be designed to enhance the resilience of urban systems, including individuals, households, and communities, and institutions?
- What are the unique needs of populations who are marginalized and in vulnerable situations?

Resilience through what?

- What are the existing **legal, regulatory, and budget frameworks**, including capacity and authorization that govern local action?
- What governance capacity exists in the potential intervention area (i.e., national, provincial, local)?
- What is the city's capacity to **mobilize domestic resources** for resilience actions?
- What are the city **government agencies** that have a key role in planning, providing, or safeguarding urban infrastructure and services (e.g., water supply, power, security, solid waste collection)? What are their current roles and relationships?
- What other **state, regional, and national government agencies** have jurisdiction over these issues and geographies? What are their current roles and relationships?
- What institutions have the authority to make the necessary decisions? Who are the key stakeholders and what capacity exists outside of government structures (e.g., private sector, citizen associations)?
- What **other stakeholders** have a role to play in promoting resilience (e.g., private sector, civil society, local religious leaders/communities, urban communities in vulnerable situations)? What capacity do they have to engage? What is the capacity of local government agencies to engage them? How can they be engaged with decision-makers? What operational mechanisms exist for civic/private sector engagement in governance processes?

---

[6] Diagnostic tools such as the World Bank's City Strength Diagnostic or UN Habitat's City Resilience Profiling tool may help to answer these questions for a specific geography.

- What are the sector- or system-level power dynamics and incentives among local actors? (See Thinking and Working Politically through Applied Political Economy Analysis).

Resilience to what end?

- What does success look like? How will urban resilience be measured?
- By whom and with what resources are those outcomes to be achieved? Will those resources need to be fully external or can they be found internally?
- Can greater policy and budget consistency be achieved between various levels of government (local, state, region, federal or local, provincial, national) to support resilience action?

Levers of Change and Integration Opportunities

- Has the city or urban area where USAID is partnering articulated **resilience priorities**?
- What ongoing or planned resilience efforts exist, if any?
- What **additional benefits** may occur as a result of USAID's proposed or existing interventions (to improve governance and urban resilience), and can these benefits lead to additional funding opportunities? For example, an improved public transit system may not only improve governance and urban resilience, but may also improve public health outcomes through increased mobility and activity. This can free up funding to address other issues.
- How might existing and future **USAID programming in other sectors** complement urban resilience interventions in the governance sector?

SPOTLIGHTING GOVERNANCE STRATEGIES TO STRENGTHEN RESILIENCE

Based on the answers to the key questions listed above, several strategies or approaches can be considered to strengthen urban resilience in USAID governance programming (illustrative activities are provided below). These governance strategies also build on the five building blocks described above and include:

- **Improve capacity for and commitment to coordinated action between local, provincial, and national governments**. This necessitates an understanding of, and reconciliation of, the various legal, fiscal, and regulatory frameworks that empower national and subnational authorities. The cross-cutting nature of risks facing the urban system requires coordinated action across different levels of government and geographic scales (i.e., neighborhoods, cities, regions). However, a lack of integration of local approaches in national policies and programs, and a lack of effective feedback loops between different tiers of government, make those national measures less responsive to local needs. On the other hand, improving systems coordination around resilience goals can yield a range of benefits, such as integration of resilience principles in city planning and implementation, better alignment of planning strategies across city institutions, enhanced cross-sectoral coordination, more creative uses of existing funds for resilience-building investments, and better intergovernmental coordination (between city, regional, and national actors) on resilience actions. As a bilateral donor, USAID is especially well-positioned to coordinate with national level governments and relevant national ministries.
- **Improve integration and coherence of relevant policies and regulations**. Targeted policies can guide the growth and development of cities in ways that account for risks. However, in

many cities, plans and policies are generated in siloed fashion without cross-linkages (e.g., a flood plan might limit development in one area whereas an economic development strategy might incentivize action in the same area). To be most effective, the policy process must be coherent, integrated, participatory, and flexible. Integration typically requires meaningful collaboration among various sectors and stakeholders at different levels of the urban system. Integration helps ensure that decision makers recognize the interconnectedness of the urban system by building shared understanding of the following: evidence, constraints, and opportunities to act; how risks are connected; and the complementarities in functions/capacities of different actors to respond.

- **Strengthen inclusion** by ensuring that those people living in the most vulnerable contexts participate in plan-making, programs, and local political processes, and benefit from activities. Direct consultation with and participation of multiple stakeholders in policy decision-making through strengthened feedback mechanisms for civil society improves understanding of specific risks and vulnerabilities, as well as existing assets.
- **Strengthen civil society**, including an independent media, which can increase public awareness and prioritization of urban resilience. In turn, this can increase the accountability of governments to strengthen urban resilience, based on increased demands for government transparency.

These strategies are interrelated. For example, direct consultation with and participation of multiple stakeholders in policy decision-making improves understanding of specific risks and vulnerability at the local level which can contribute to more coherent policies and programs.

ILLUSTRATIVE ACTIVITIES

Based on the initial analysis and identification of urban resilience opportunities, specific activities can be considered for incorporation into governance sector programming. The table below provides examples of urban resilience activities that may be appropriate for USAID governance programs.

Table 1. Illustrative Activities of Governance Activities to Strengthen Urban Resilience

Sub-Theme	Illustrative Activities
Strengthen the capacity of executive and legislative institutions at all levels of government	- Encourage the use of budget review tools that incorporate resilience such as the Post-Disaster Public Financial Management Review - Provide training and technical support to improve support for urban resilience - Provide capacity building/training on working across silos, and on stakeholder engagement (particularly working with those stakeholders in the most vulnerable situations) - Support greater alignment with relevant regional/state/national policies (e.g., water resilience) - Support drafting and enforcement of building codes that respond to risks (e.g., earthquake, hurricanes), climate trends (e.g., temperature changes), and local energy resources (e.g., needs to reduce reliance on natural gas) - Support land-use planning; support development and enforcement of zoning regulations to address shocks - Encourage participatory consultations in target intervention areas - Strengthen the capacity of urban and regional councils/legislative bodies and national legislatures to conduct budget and policy analysis on urban resilience risks and assets

Provide effective, inclusive and citizen-responsive service delivery	• Promote the use of solar or LED street lighting to promote public safety and resiliency to system failures (example: USAID's Afghan Clean Energy Project (ACEP)'s solar lighting in Faizabad) • Support the creation of public-private partnerships (PPP) for municipal waste collection, and waste to energy programs • Promote sustainable public transportation, with a focus on inclusive transit access (see Dakar example) • Ensure the participation of populations dealing with vulnerable situations and marginalization in public processes • Increase media capacity and coverage of risks and urban resilience measures taken by local governments • Support citizen engagement with local governments in decision-making (e.g., emergency evacuation plans, disaster preparedness and response, urban regulatory plans) • Introduce or expand the use of geographic information systems (GIS) in municipal processes, for example to create natural capital inventories or flood hazard maps (see the USAID/Jordan CITIES project, which addressed spatial planning, street signage, and municipal investment planning) • Enable the use of mobile technology for citizen participation and engagement (for example, enabling residents to notify relevant municipal departments of broken streetlights, flooded storm drains, pollution, or other resiliency hazards) • Increase energy grid resilience of municipal buildings through on-site power generation (e.g., rooftop solar), resource efficiency programs[7], or microgrids that can go into island-mode during disasters • Support local governments on protecting and maintaining green infrastructure for stormwater capture
Efficiently and transparently mobilize and spend public resources	• Develop green procurement standards (see Quezon City, Philippines program example) • Support participatory budgeting processes to include citizen input into resiliency measures like road repair and protection of green space (see Macedonia example) • Increase own-source revenue generation to support resilience measures • Prepare and purchase individual or pooled parametric insurance policies (see Medellin, Colombia example) • Publish government procurement awards to increase transparency and accountability

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS: GOVERNANCE AND URBAN RESILIENCE

USAID's Strengthening Urban Resilience for Growth with Equity (SURGE) Program in the Philippines **(2015-2021)** assisted cities and adjacent areas to plan effectively, guarantee basic public services, reduce business transaction costs, promote competitiveness, support sustainable development, and reduce disaster and climate change risks while ensuring inclusive and sustainable growth. One of the four

---

[7] For example, see USAID's Municipal Energy Reform Project in Ukraine.

key areas was strengthening local capacity in inclusive and resilient urban development, including the promotion of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

USAID/Mozambique's [Coastal City Adaptation Program](#) (CCAP) (2013-2018) increased coastal resilience to climate change in the country's secondary cities by improving the provision of climate-resilient urban services by municipalities, increasing adoption of resilient housing design and construction techniques by residents as well as civic and community organizations, and strengthening local awareness of economic risk-management tools for at-risk urban infrastructure and livelihoods. Capacity building efforts involved multiple stakeholders, including national ministries, city authorities, civic organizations, and community members. CCAP contributed to developing emergency standard operating procedures and various training programs, producing vulnerability maps, upgrading public information services and early warning systems, and restoring mangrove forests. Some key lessons included the importance of carrying out detailed baseline assessments, mainstreaming resilience goals into broader urban development plans and budgets, ensuring coordination with higher levels of government, and securing private-sector buy-in.[8]

FUNDING

USAID Funding

Funding for governance-related programming is directed primarily through a DRG earmark. For instance, in FY20, $1.66 billion[9] in DRG funding was obligated to 840 activities in 110 countries and regions at USAID. This figure represents the wide variety of programs that can be funded with DRG funds, yet large amounts of the funds are designated for a few countries like Jordan and Afghanistan. This means that some missions have significantly lower levels of DRG funding. Furthermore, in addition to good governance programming, DRG funds support work in elections and political processes, civil society and media strengthening, improving rule of law and human rights, and economic governance. With DRG funds divided among so many sub-sectors, there is less than may be expected for governance work, and even less for urban resilience.

This analysis aligns with a broader question of "how does DRG funding work?" Like all government funding, DRG funds are allocated through a budget process that builds off previous years' requests. Those baselines are then used at both missions and headquarters to establish an expectation of funds based on available resources coupled with existing and emerging needs. USAID staff – mission directors, technical staff, as well as technical advisors at headquarters, can all provide input into the allocation of funding. One key stakeholder group – Regional Coordinators in the DRG Center – can weigh in on their priorities for funding levels. These staff do not have official decision making authority, but their opinions are regarded as leadership distributes funding to address current DRG priorities.

Although funding decisions might appear overly prescribed, DRG funds can be used to explicitly or implicitly build urban resilience. DRG funds can also be pooled or braided with resources from different sectors or sources to fund a specific resilience initiative; each funding stream can serve a different purpose and address a different programmatic element. For example, climate change adaptation funds can be used to increase the capacity of local governments to adapt to climate-related shocks and stresses, and combining those funds with other program funds to increase adaptive capacity to non-climate related shocks and stresses like pandemics, conflicts or other disasters. For example, USAID's [CityLinks program](#), which ran from 2011-

---

[8] Taken from https://urban-links.org/wp-content/uploads/USAID_DDP_Handbook_508.pdfk, pg 32.

[9] According to https://www.foreignassistance.gov/agencies, accessed April 26, 2023.

2016, used a blend of program funds, including funds for clean water, global health, and climate change adaptation, to support technical partnerships between local governments to address a variety of municipal challenges.[10]

Many of USAID's local governance programs contain funding for small grants, referred to as "Grants Under Contract," so that local government associations, media outlets, universities and civil society organizations can implement pilot projects. While this funding is limited, it can be a useful way to enable pilot projects that may be able to then access other external funding sources once implemented.

Non-USAID Funding

There are a variety of external funding options to consider that could be leveraged to enhance resilience aspects of governance programs. In most cases these alternatives would fund complementary activities, or provide resources directly to governmental or non-governmental partners.

Credit or Bond Guarantees: USAID funding can create public-private partnerships and leverage private sector financing through the use of partial credit guarantees by working with the **Development Finance Corporation** (DFC), previously known as the Development Credit Authority. Partial guarantees have been used by USAID to support municipal bond issuances in countries where local governments have the authority to take on debt. Municipalities can finance their investments in resilience through constructing or rehabilitating urban infrastructure such as energy supply and distribution, water management and drainage, and roads and transport. As the infrastructure generates returns or savings, investors are repaid. Projects can be pooled across municipalities so that more capital can be raised, and weaker municipalities benefit from a better credit rating. Economies of scale in the underwriting process allow transaction cost savings.

The DFC has also been used to support the city of Dakar in restructuring its urban transportation network to include electric buses.

> **Program Example: Bond Guarantee**
>
> USAID/Serbia's Sustainable Local Development Project was a six-year initiative supporting local governments, businesses, and civil society to increase economic growth through inter-municipal cooperation. The project focused on 32 municipalities in 8 regions. In the city of Novi Sad, USAID provided a partial credit guarantee to enable the city to issue its first-ever municipal bond. The bond proceeds were used to finance infrastructure improvements including road and water projects.

Insurance: USAID can support local governments in purchasing individual or pooled parametric insurance policies that can be used to mitigate budget impacts from disaster response and recovery (see the Medellin example). USAID is working with the UN Capital Development Fund to create an insurance product for infrastructure resilience with a focus on governance policies and structures that need to be in place for implementation. USAID/Nepal's 3PERM project convened the insurance and building industries to support disaster-resilience construction.

Bilateral and multilateral donors: Opportunities exist for USAID to leverage existing investments by other organizations working on urban resilience such as the World Bank and other bilateral agencies. As a member of the Cities Alliance, USAID has access to other contributing donors to explore possibilities of collaboration.

---

[10] For more information on the CityLinks program, see https://icma.org/documents/citylinks-review-five-years-fostering-partnerships

In addition, the C40 Cities Finance Facility (CFF) facilitates access to finance for climate change mitigation and resilience projects in urban areas by providing technical assistance to develop cities' sustainability priorities into bankable investment proposals. The CFF was initially funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and USAID, with support from the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB). USAID can assist target cities with applying to this facility.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Similar to many DRG interventions, monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) about the performance of urban resilience policies and measures can be challenging. A key resource is the guide to urban resilience measurement developed by Mercy Corps for USAID, which includes a training curriculum.[11]

An Activity MEL Plan (AMELP) is one of the most important opportunities to ensure that resilience measurement is incorporated at the activity level and relevant indicators directly link to a result (outputs or outcomes) within the activity's logic model.[12] With resilience focused activities that share a common link - such as operating within the urban energy sector - a portfolio approach can also be considered which would guide the measurement of their collective impact by building a MEL plan around the activities as a portfolio instead of a single activity. Such a portfolio approach can then be more effectively connected to high-level objectives set forth in a CDCS or other relevant strategy.

Governance programs that aim to improve urban resilience may need to monitor and evaluate progress on **sources of resilience** (often grouped into categories or resilience capacities) related to specific types of shocks or stresses that are contextually appropriate. To know which sources of resilience are relevant for the urban energy sector, and/or groups of interest, programs should identify the shocks and/or stresses expected in the program area, and corresponding indicators and methods for tracking their occurrence and severity. USAID has created guidance for a standard Risk and Resilience Assessment that can be used to identify and analyze these shocks and stresses, along with local systems that influence resilience outcomes in an operating environment. Once relevant shocks and stresses have been identified, along with sources of resilience to strengthen that support the well-being outcomes of the activity, methods and approaches for data collection can be identified. For example, a recurrent monitoring survey (RMS) for larger activities can consider recurrent monitoring pre- and post-shock where appropriate. Assessments can be implemented for two complementary purposes (1) to monitor key outcomes and coping strategies after a shock or (2) provide routine data availability in a rapidly changing environment to support adaptive management. Noting that resilience depends on the effective urban systems, it is important to **consider metrics that accurately capture the spatial and functional aspects of governance** that affect the program's desired outcomes. USAID's Market System Resilience Assessment (MSRA) can help understand how systemic incentives shape and constrain the response of individual actors (e.g. households) to shocks and stresses.

---

[11] See Urban Resilience Measurement, https://www.mercycorps.org/research-resources/urban-resilience-measurement

[12] Recommendations on how to integrate resilience into activity level programming can be found in the Resilience in Activity Design and Implementation Discussion Note.

Standard Indicators

There are several [Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators](#) that can be used to streamline reporting on resilience in the urban governance sector.[13] The use of Congressionally-earmarked funding such as climate change may necessitate the use of one of the climate-change standard indicators. It is important to ensure that indicators chosen for any intervention not only adhere to reporting requirements, but also capture the appropriate targeted elements of an intervention. The following standard indicators may be appropriate for USAID urban resilience programs in the governance sector:

- Number of people using climate information or implementing risk-reducing actions to improve resilience to climate change as supported by USG assistance (Disaggregated by male/female) (EG.11-6)
- Number of people supported by the USG to adapt to the effects of climate change (EG.11-5)
- Amount of investment mobilized (in USD) for climate change adaptation as supported by USG assistance (EG.11-4)
- Number of laws, policies, regulations, or standards addressing climate change adaptation formally proposed, adopted, or implemented as supported by USG assistance (Disaggregated by national/sub-national/regional; and proposed/adopted/implemented (EG.11-3)
- Number of institutions with improved capacity to assess or address climate change risks supported by USG assistance (Disaggregated by national or sub-national) (EG.11-2)
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, estimated in metric tons of CO_2 equivalent, reduced, sequestered, or avoided through clean energy supported by USG assistance (EG.12-6)
- Projected greenhouse gas emissions reduced or avoided from adopted laws, policies, regulations, or technologies related to clean energy as supported by USG assistance (EG.12-7)
- Number of institutions with improved capacity to assess or address climate change risks supported by US Government assistance
- Number of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use supported by USG assistance
- Number of governmental agencies (national or subnational levels) with improved performance
- Number of governmental agencies (national or subnational levels) receiving organizational capacity development support
- Type of investment: Private sector partner leveraged amount

Custom Indicators

Standard indicators can be aggregated across USAID investments, allowing for USAID to report at an agency level. By contrast, the use of **custom indicators**, while not able to be aggregated, may better capture the specific and integrated aspects of urban resilience activities in the governance sectors. A useful resource is the **DRG Learning, Evidence and Analysis Platform**[14] whose "program metric inventory" contains a [repository of governance indicators](#) that have been used by USAID. These include:

- Number of building permits updated and reviewed in the GIS system

---

[13] For the full list of FY21 Standard Indicators, please see https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Public-PPR-Full-MIL-Standard-Indicators-Report.xlsx

[14] https://idea.usaid.gov/drg#tab-metrics:-indicator-inventories

- Number of businesses and local stakeholders participating in the drafting and approval process of Municipal Urban Regulatory Plans
- Number of technical activities jointly designed with cross sector partners
- Number of communities with adequate disaster capacity
- Number of consensus building forums held with USG assistance
- Number of media activities conducted with USG assistance to strengthen public awareness of local governance and responsibilities
- Number of small infrastructure projects supported by the activity to improve local services[15]

Other relevant indicators include the Local Government Self Assessment Tool Score.[16]

Evaluation

USAID uses impact and performance evaluations to understand the characteristics and outcomes of USAID's activities, improve effectiveness, and make decisions about current and future programming.[17] ADS 201 describes requirements for evaluations, and the USAID Evaluation Toolkit provides guidance for planning, managing, and learning from evaluations. The choice to conduct an impact and/or performance evaluation for an activity, portfolio or project depends on its purpose, i.e. it should be made based on the question that must be answered or knowledge gap that must be filled.

A single evaluation can be designed to use multiple methods based on the purpose of the evaluation and the questions to be answered. The evaluation approach (experimental, quasi-experimental, or non-experimental) and data collection process (desk review, key informant interviews, surveys) should be determined by the evidence needed to fulfill the purpose of the evaluation. Other considerations should include: complexity, cost, data availability, rigor and contextual limitations.

Evaluation of USAID/Philippines' Strengthening Urban Resilience for Growth with Equity (SURGE) Program

USAID/Philippines provided technical assistance to secondary cities and adjacent areas to strengthen local capacity in inclusive and resilient urban development, promote low-emission local economic development strategies, and expand economic connectivity and access between urban and rural areas. The end-of-project performance evaluation assessed the relevance of SURGE to addressing the development challenges outlined in Government of Philippines and USAID policies and strategy documents, effectiveness of achieving its objectives, and the sustainability of initiatives and outcomes after project completion. The mixed-methods evaluation involved document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, a stakeholder survey, and case studies. The evaluation also conducted a comparative analysis using baseline data and endline outputs and outcomes.

---

[15] https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00Z4RW.pdf page 4.

[16] This tool was used by USAID's Coastal Cities Adaptation Program to measure progress. See https://www.chemonics.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/CCAP_Final-Report_Feb-2019.pdf

[17] See ADS 201

KEY RESOURCES

Below is a curated list of key USAID resources that can provide assistance and guidance for incorporating urban resilience into governance programming. Further below is a list of selected publications, tools, and other resources.

USAID Resources

- USAID ATLAS's Building Climate Resilience in Urban Systems.
- USAID IDEA Lab's DRG Metrics. This inventory contains commonly used programmatic approaches related to USAID programming in the Democracy, Human Rights and Governance sector.
- Improving Subnational Domestic Resource Mobilization. This USAID document provides guidance on strengthening subnational domestic resource mobilization for improved service delivery in urban areas of developing countries, including cities (small- and intermediate-sized), city-regions, and peri-urban areas.

USAID Policies and Strategies:

- USAID Climate Strategy
- USAID Urban Policy (it should be noted that this policy has been retired, however it remains an informative resource of urban programming)
- USAID DRG Strategy (updated version to be released in mid to late 2023)
- USAID Democratic Decentralization Programming Handbook

MEL Guidance

- Urban Resilience Measurement: An Approach Guide and Training Curriculum
- Resilience Measurement Practical Guidance Series: Guidance Note 5 – Design and Planning for Resilience Monitoring and Evaluation at the Activity Level

Selected External Resources

- ICLEI – a global network of local governments focused on low emission, nature-based, equitable, resilient and circular development. Members and experts work together through peer exchange, partnerships and capacity building to create systemic change for urban sustainability
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). Handbook for Local Government Leaders to make their cities resilient
- International City/County Management Association (ICMA). CityLinks Primer on Subnational Approaches for Low Emission Climate Resilient Development. This primer is an introduction to the key principles and practices of low carbon, climate resilient development. It is designed to be used by local government officials, development practitioners and international donor organizations pursuing projects with this aim at the community and regional levels

Funding/Financing Urban Resilience

- [Building Climate Resilience in Cities Through Insurance](#)
- C40's [Cities Finance Facility](#) supports cities in developing and emerging economies to develop finance-ready projects that address climate change. [USAID fact sheet](#).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS